STUDIES IN THE BRĀHMAṆAS

A. C. BANERJEA

A. C. BANERJEA

STUDIES
IN THE
BRĀHMAṆAS

A. C. BANERJEA

AL
DASS
INA

STUDIES IN THE BRĀHMAṆAS

BY

A. C. BANERJEA.

M. A., Ph. D. (LONDON)

Motilal Banarsidass
DELHI :: VARANASI :: PATNA

Published by :
Sundar Lal Jain
MOTILAL BANARSIDASS
BUNGALOW ROAD,
JAWAHAR NAGAR, DELHI-6.

Printed by :
Shanti Lal Jain,
SHRI JAINENDRA PRESS,
BUNGALOW ROAD.
JAWAHAR NAGAR DELHI-6.

FIRST EDITION
1963
Price Rs. 15.00

Copies available at:—

1. MOTILAL BANARSIDASS, Bungalow Road, Jawahar Nagar, Post Box 1586, Delhi-6.
2. MOTILAL BANARSIDASS, Nepali Khapra, Post Box 75, Varanasi.
3. MOTILAL BANARSIDASS, Bankipur, Patna-4.

CONTENTS

Abbreviations. v
Preface vii
Foreword ix
Translation xi
Introduction. xiii

Chapter I. 1—7

'Ari' in the Ṛgveda.

Chapter II. 8—31

Clan Exogamy in the Brāhmaṇas.
  (a) 'Jana'
  (b) 'Jāmi'

Chapter III. 32—72

Family Relationship.
  (a) 'Agre-didhiṣu', 'Didhisūpati' 'Parivitta', 'Parivividāna'
  (b) 'Ānujāvara'
  (c) 'Bhrātṛvya'
  (d) 'Sajāta'

Chapter IV. 73—80

Social and Functional Groups.

Chapter V. 81—172

The Vrātya Problem.

Appendix to Chapter II. 173—174
General Bibliography. 175—176
Periodicals 177
Index 179—185

Abbreviations

A. B.	Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.
Āśv. Gṛ. S.	Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra.
Āś. Śr. Sutras.	Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra.
A. V.	Atharva-Veda
A. K.	Amara Kośa.
Āp. Dh. S.	Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra.
Āpas. Śr. S.	Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra.
Baudh. Śr. S.	Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra.
D.J.B. in 'A'.	Das Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl-Caland.
Dh. S.	Āpastambīya Dharma Saṃhitā.
J. B.	Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa—ed. by Raghuvira-Lokesa.
K. B.	Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa.
Kap. S.	Kapiṣṭhala Saṃhitā.
K. S.	Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā.
Kāty. Śr. S.	Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra.
Lāṭ. Śr. S.	Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra.
Manu.	Manusmṛti.
M. S.	Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā.
M. bh.	Mahābhāṣya.—ed. Keilhorn.
Nir.	Nirukta.
Nigh. Nir.	Nighaṇṭu-Nirukta ed. Laksmanasvarupa
P. B.	Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa.
R. V.	Ṛgveda.
	Ṛgvedabhāṣya (Skandasvāmin)
	Ṛgveda-vyākhyā (Mādhava)
	Ṛgartha-dīpikā (Veṅkaṭa Mādhava).
Ś. B. (M).	Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (Mādhyandina)
Ś. B. (K).	Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (Kāṇva).
Śāṇkh. Śr. S.	Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra.
Ṣaḍ. B.	Ṣaḍviṃśa Brāhmaṇa.—ed. Eelsingh.
S. C.	Smṛti-candrikā.
T. S.	Taittirīya Saṃhitā.

T. B.	Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa.
Uṇ. S.	Uṇādi Sūtras.
V. S.	Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā.
Y. V.	Yajurveda.

For other abbreviations, see General Bibliography.

PREFACE

This book was written more than ten years ago and is being published so late with hardly any alterations. I feel, therefore, that I owe an apology to my readers for having found nothing new to add to my original findings even after the lapse of so many years. As a matter of fact, more fruitful fields of investigations have engaged my attention since then, and I had till late almost given up the idea of bringing these rather unorthodox conclusions of mine to the notice of the Vedic scholars. The comparative silence of scholars on the words here discussed, however, convinces me that some purpose may be served in laying them before those interested in the subject with the hope that the interpretation of such difficult words as 'jana', 'jāmi', 'bhrātṛvya' etc., found in the Brāhmaṇas may create no further problems.

The problems of the Vedic 'ari' and 'vrātya' have assumed new proportions with the recent researches of Thieme and others, and it is now my earnest desire to concentrate on them more fully and present to the world of scholars a more detailed study on their significance as soon as possible.

To Prof. Louis Renou of France I am specially thankful for the trouble he has taken in kindly writing out the Foreword to my work. To Prof. John Brough of the University of London my thanks are due in a large measure for his painstaking guidance and valuable advice in the compilation of this work. I am also grateful to my pupil and colleague, Dr. J. P. Sinha for carefully going through the proofs and preparing the index. I am equally thankful to another pupil and colleague of mine, Dr. M. L. Rastogi for valuable assistance on many occasions. Despite all care many lapses are still to be found in my work, for which I crave the indulgence of the reader.

It remains for me to express my gratitude to Messrs. Moti Lal Banarsi Dass, Oriental Publishers and Book-sellers for undertaking the publication of this work.

LUCKNOW
June 8, 1963.

A. C. Banerjea

FOREWORD

J'ai connu M. A. C. Banerjea lors de mon passage a Lucknow. Il interpretait avec talent un role important dans le Mudra-rākśaṣa que l'on jouait dans cette ville a l'occasion du jubile de l'Universite.

Je pensais qu'il ferait carriere dans les etudes traditionelle; par exemple dans le kāvya ou l' alaṁkāraśāstra.

C'est avec quelque surprise que je l'ai vu se diriger vers le domaine si difficile et passablement oublie de nos jours, celui des Brāhmaṇas. Il ya apporte un esprit neuf et penetrant, en faisant beneficier ces vieux textes des lumieres inattendues que les theories modernes de sociologie permettent de projeter sur eux.

M. Banerjea s'est attaque d'emblee a une serie de termes difficiles : des noms exprimant la parente, comme sajāta, bhrātṛvya, ānujāvara et plusieurs autres; des termes indiquant l'exogamie de clan, comme jana et jāmi; d'autres termes fonctionnels. Il ne craint pas d'affronter de nouveau des termes souvent controverses, comme le probleme du vrātya ou la notion d'ari. Ces deux derniers problemes, et surtout celui d'ari, montrent qu'il sait lorsqu'il le faut deborder le cadre strict des Brāhmaṇas et qu'il discute avec pertinence sur des mantras.

Son idee centrale est de determiner des mots qui impliquent la notion du groupe exogamique par opposition au groupe "Non-marriageable". J'avoue etre fort seduit par son interpretation de ari comme "individu appartenant a un groupe exogamique" (autrement dit, individu avec lequel le mariage est licite); la maniere dont il explique les deux passages cruciaux R. V. 9.97,3 et 10.28, 1 ne peur manquer de reteni l'attention. Toutefois il faut reconnaitre que la notion d'ari, prise dans sa generalite, deborde ce cadre assez etroit, a moins d'admettre, ce qui est fort posible, qu'un ancien terme a valeur exogamique ait perdu peu a peu son sens propre au point de designer un etranger en general, evec une nuance affective, tantot amicale, tantot (plus souvent) hostile.

On aurait tort de considerer la recherche de M. Banerjea comme exigue. Il s'agit de mots importants, dont l'exegese precise importe a notre connaissance de la societe vedique. Ensuite, l'auteur a aussi des choses utiles a nous apprendre sur les termes de parente et sur diverses questions connexes.

Il me semble que ce travail apporte bien des elements qui meritent la reflexion, sinon l'adhesion, et qu'il s'inscrit avec honheur dans le cadre relativement limite des recherches portant sur les Brāhmaṇas, qui ont ete faites jusqu'a ce jour tant en Occident que dans l'Inde meme.

PARIS AVRIL 1959. *Sd. Louis Renou.*

TRANSLATION

I have known Mr. A. C. Banerjea since my short stay at Lucknow. He interpreted with talent an important role in the Mudrā-rākṣasa staged in that town on the occasion of the jubilee of the University.

I expected that he would take up in future studies in the literary traditions e. g. the kāvya or the alaṃkāraśāstra. It was, therefore, somewhat surprising that I found him directed towards a domain so difficult and almost forgotten today, namely that of the Brāhmaṇas. He suggests a novel and penetrating approach to these old texts of obscure wisdom in applying to them with advantage the modern theories of sociology.

At the outset, Mr. Banerjea encounters a series of difficult terms ; some names expressing parentage as *sajāta*, *bhrātṛvya*, *ānujāvara* and many others; some terms indicating the exogamy of the clan such as *Jana* and *Jāmi* and some others of functional significance. He does not hesitate to consider afresh (attack a new) many terms of frequent controversy such as the problem of *vrātya* or notion of *ari*. The last two problems and chiefly that of ari indicate that he knows when to go beyond the strictly limited sphere of the Brāhmaṇas and discuss them in as much as they pertain to the Saṁhitās.

His central idea is to determine precisely the significance of words implying the notion of the exogamous group as opposed to the group 'non-marriageable'. I confess to have been fascinated (seduced) by his interpretation of *ari* as 'individual' belonging to the exogamous group (in other words the individual with whom marriage is lawful); the manner in which he explains the two crucial passages RV. 9.79.3 and 10.28.1 cannot fail to attract attention. Nevertheless it has to be kept in mind that the notion of *ari* taken in its generality goes much beyond these extremely narrow limits, unless one admits, that which is quite possible, that an ancient term of exogamous significance had lost little by little its proper sense till it came to designate a stranger in general, with an emotional (affective) nuance, sometimes amicable and at other times (more often) hostile.

One would be in the wrong to consider the researches of Mr. Banerjea as scanty. The question here is of important words the precise exegesis of which is of considerable significance for our understanding of the Vedic society. In addition to this, the author has given us useful information with regard to the terms of parentage and many other connected problems.

It seems to me that this work raises quite a few points which merit reflection if not approval and is with advantage listed with the relatively limited researches on the Brāhmaṇas, that have been carried on so far both in the West as well as in India.

Paris, April, 1959. Louis Renou.

Introduction

This study was originally undertaken in order to investigate social conditions in the Brāhmaṇa period. Soon, however, it became apparent that the evidence in the texts was of too scanty a nature to provide a complete picture, but a number of interesting problems in family and tribal relationships emerged.

For example, in the first half which is concerned with the investigation of evidence for clan exogamy in this period and the allied question of relationship-terminology, the point arises of the words 'jana' and 'jāmi'. 'Jana', a word inferred by most authorities to mean in certain contexts, 'the stranger', comprises the marriageable exogamous group. 'Jāmi' is similarly inferred as the 'non-approachable', the 'non-marriageable' group. Further, in the question of family-relationship we come across the words 'agredidhiṣu', signifying 'the woman wooed before'; 'didhiṣūpatiḥ', the husband of such a woman; 'parivitta', the un-married elder brother; 'parividāna', the younger brother who is married during the time that his elder brother remains a bachelor; 'ānujāvara', who is either the posthumous son, or the younger brother inferior in rank; and 'bhrātṛvya', brother-in-law. Finally, we have the general word 'sajāta', signifying fellow-clansman. This part concludes with a short description of the social and functional groupings, much of which may be restatement of earlier conclusions. Specifically, however, a differentiation not previously noted is made between the 'takṣan' and 'rathakāra' groups, the 'takṣan' as the carpenter, unworthy by reason of his impurity to take part in the sacrifices, and the 'rathakāra' as the craftsman of specialised importance with full sacrificial rights.

The second half attempts to deal with the complex problem of the Vrātyas. In the first place it is a detailed review of former contributions in this field. In the second place, it attempts an etymological explanation of the word 'vrātya'. The connection of the Ṛgvedic 'vrā' with the subsequent 'vrātya' seems undeniable, but no theory of continuity between the two words can be built up, as the meaning of 'vrā' is itself uncertain. In the third place an independent theory is advanced that the Vrātya book of the Atharvaveda is, in fact, compiled from fragments of a lost Brāhmaṇa work, specially belonging to the Vrātyas. This theory rests firstly on the patently Brahmanical style of this book, and secondly as a picture is given here of something analogous to the subsequent rituals of the 'kṣatriyas, especially as in the Rājasūya. In the fourth place the Tāṇḍya and the Jaiminīya references to the Vrātyas are discussed at length, and towards the end the conclusion is reached that the Vrātyas were non-Brahmanical Aryans, (possibly similar to the Vedic 'kṣatriyas), who incurred the contempt of the Brahmans only or more specially by their alien ritual practices.

Lastly, in the appendix to Chapter Four comes a short but pertinent discussion of the available evidence for Sapiṇḍa restriction in the Śatapatha.

It has long been a generally accepted view that there is no evidence for exogamy in India before the time of the Sūtras, and admittedly it is in the pravara-appendices that we first find the prohibition of marriage within the Gotra explicitly stated. It has, however, been suggested by Professor J. Brough[1] that, since the hymn families of the Ṛgveda were directly connected with the main Gotra-groupings of the Śutra period, there is a permissible inference that such units may have been exogamous prior to the age of the Sūtras; for it is more likely that exogamy would have grown as a natural process within the clan, rather than as a superimposition upon existing clan-structure. Furthermore, Benveniste, in one of his lectures[2] in the School of Oriental and African studies, proposed that the word 'ari' in the Ṛgveda stood for the hostile exogamous group, and its derivative 'arya' for the progeny of a legitimate union, who naturally would be considered as 'respectable' or 'noble'. With a view to confirming these conjectures the investigation begins with a brief discourse on the meaning of 'ari' in the Ṛgveda.

---

[1] 'The Early History of the Gotrās' JRAS 1946, 1947.

[2] An unpublished lecture.

CHAPTER I.

'ARI' IN THE ṚGVEDA

The word 'ari' in the Ṛgveda has both a favourable as well as an unfavourable sense. Vedic exegetes[1] have long been puzzled by this undeniable ambivalence[2] in the conception of the Ṛgvedic 'ari' and have attempted successively to give to this word an uniform meaning which would apply to all contexts in which it appears. It is unnecessary to review here all the interpretations suggested by Roth, Grassman, Bergaigne, Oldenberg, Geldner, Neisser, Bloomfield and others with regard to 'ari' as they are well-known to Vedic scholars. Moreover they have already been repeatedly mentioned in the work[3] of Thieme, which is undoubtedly the most detailed study of this difficult problem. At the outset, therefore, it would be more appropriate, in the first place, to indicate briefly the views of Thieme in this connection and then state the view-point of Dumézil,[4] who is the most recent scholar expressing his opinion on this subject.

According to Thieme 'ari' should be interpreted as 'stranger'. ('Der Fremde' where the friendly or inimical nature of 'ari' is not emphatically stated and 'der Fremdling' when it is thus expressed). In his opinion the concept of 'stranger' alone, implies the type of 'inner discord' (Zwiespaeltigkeit) that characterizes 'ari' inasmuch as it refers at one time to the 'friend' and at another to the 'enemy'. Thus while the stranger could be received in a friendly way and granted hospitality, and be entitled to protection when he asks for it, he could also be regarded with suspicion or hatred as one outside the pale of the family or the clan-structure, and on entering the house of some one, menacing the peace of that place'.[1] Basing his understanding of the word 'ari' on this concept he explains the passages in the Ṛgveda in which 'ari' and its derivatives occur. Primarily he divides them into two groups, those in which he interprets 'ari' as 'der Fremde' and others in which he finds for it the meaning 'der Fremdling', and further with reference to the latter he has another subdivision as far as they are concerned with either 'the stranger as friend' or ,the stranger as enemy'. Next he proceeds to an analysis of the stems 'aryá' (Oxytone), 'árya' (Paroxytone),[2] showing that being derived from 'ari' (stranger) they should signify 'one concerned with the stranger' (dem Fremdling gehoerig), who in the context of the deities is 'the protector of the stranger' (den Fremdling beschuetzend) and in that of the mortals is the same as 'the hospitable one—the master of the House' (gastlich Hausherr). Finally he considers 'Aryaman' as 'hospitality personified — the God of hospitality' (die personifizierte Gastlichkeit, der Gott der Gastlichkeit)[3] and 'ārya', derived from 'árya' (Par.) as 'related to the hospitable ones—the hospitable ones' (zu den Gastlichen gehoerig, die Wirtlichen).

---

[1] Bloomfield calls it the 'enfant terrible of Vedic exegesis' (J. A. O. S. 45, 160) while Thieme thinks of it as 'Sorgenkind' (D. F. 5).

[2] According to Renou ,un trait stable du formulaire Ṛgvedique. (J. A. CCXXX 333).

[3] Der Fremdling in Ṛgveda. (D. F.).

[4] L. T. S., also Rev. de l' His. des Rel. 1941, 36-54.

Dumézil, who is mainly concerned with Aryaman in his work[4] objects to this rendering of 'ari' as 'stranger', on the ground that the conception of the 'stranger' is a 'notion moderne', and cannot be considered applicable to the primitive social conditions in the Ṛgveda, except in its purely negative form. He admits, however, that for a clear understanding of 'ari' "one has to look in the direction of the 'Fremdling' with a view to find a meaning more concrete, more positive and also less modern than 'Fremdling'".[5] Accordingly he interprets 'ari' in its collective sense as 'L' ensemble des aryens' and in its generic sense as 'L'aryen moyen' or 'L'aryen type'.

The novelty of these two interpretations can hardly be denied, and any one of them being accepted should help us in

---

1. D. F. 10
2. 'árya' (Paroxytone) is not found in the Ṛgveda and occurs only in the Later Saṃhitās.
3. According to Thieme the neuter form 'aryaman' and also the masculine form 'aryaman' (without any reference to the deity) in the Ṛgveda convey the idea of hospitable' and 'hosptable' respectively. (D. R. 141).
4. L. T. S., The article appearing in the Revue de l 'Histoire des Religion is merely a reprint of the section dealing with 'arya'.
5. Ibid- 111.

solving the vexing riddle of this word. Unfortunately, however, this is not the case. The vagueness that Dumézil justly attributes to the concept of the stranger proposed by Thieme equally accompanies his own deduction. If one is rather uncertain about the role that the stranger played in the Ṛgvedic society, he could by no means be certain about those "with whom a group of Vedic Indians accepted their relationship through the bonds of "aryanité".[1] Obviously, therefore, what precisely is meant by 'ari' in the Ṛgveda, still remains a desideratum, and yet another attempt to come closer to its inner significance would not be in vain.

Now, undoubtedly only the singular form[2] of 'ari' appears in the Ṛgveda, and the simultaneous occurence of the plural forms 'kṛṣṭayaḥ' (I. 4. 6.), 'janān' (V. 33. 2), 'sūrayaḥ' (VI. 25. 7) in apposition to it, leads us to the natural conclusion that here the case is that of a collective singular,[3] and as such it should be a collective designation.[4] Consequently we have to give to 'ari' an impersonal meaning, and this is exactly what Thieme and Dumézil have tried to do. It is, however, most unlikely that the word had either an ethnic significance as Dumézil wants us to believe or even conveyed the idea of a 'sorte d'essence ou de type, trop general pour etre un image, et trop emotional pour etre un concept' as Thieme thinks, especially in the early period of the Ṛgveda. Is it not striking that as soon as we come to the Brāhmaṇas the meaning of 'ari' as 'enemy' is well-nigh fixed[5] and the need for a wider conception does not arise ? How much more reasonable it would be to think of it as representing a much more limited and well-defined group or groups in the society of those days. Such divisions can obviously be thought of only in the context of marriage as contracted between exogamous clans. It cannot be denied that there is, in fact, no direct evidence for the practice of clan-exogamy prior to the period of the Sūtras. It stands to reason, however, that the clans mentioned in the Ṛgveda, being clearly known as 'exogamous units' in the Sūtras, should have adhered to the principle of exogamy in as much as marital relationship was concerned.[1] Thus if the existence of the exogamous system is accepted for a period as early as that of the Ṛgveda, it follows necessarily that such exogamous groups must have found some common term to express in general the relationship that existed between them. In other words a member of a certain exogamous group, would naturally prefer to refer to those belonging to another such group or groups into which he wishes to marry or with which he is already connected through marriage, by some term which would directly express that type of kinship. That 'ari' could be the desired vocable can be deduced from two happy coincidences. Primarily the inimical sense of 'ari' can easily be explained in such circumstances, as it is almost well-known that in most of the the primitive societies an amount of hostility is found to be somewhat inevitable between two neighbouring tribes,[2] which are presumably exogamous. Secondly the deity 'Aryaman'. whose connection with 'arya', a derivative of 'ari' hardly needs an elucidation, is essentially linked with the ritual of marriage in the Ṛgveda; he is in fact 'un des grands dieux marieurs'.[3] Summarily, therefore, it may be held that 'ari' in the Ṛgveda designates the marriagable exogamous group in the clan-structure of those days. It remains to be seen now if, in the text itself there is some conclusive evidence to support this conjecture.

---

[1] L. T. s. 113.

[2] Dumezil thinks that both the Nominative and Accusative plural forms of 'ari' are also found in the RV. Unfortunately, however, there is no sound reason to think so.

[3] Cf. D. F. 'kollektiver Singular' (161).

[4] Cf. Renou. J· A. 230 334.

[5] 'arya' however retains its former significance to some extent. See Mahāvrata references.

Of special interest is R. V. X. 28. 1: ,viśvo hy anyo arir ājagāma, mamed aha śvaśuro nā jagāma; jakṣīyād dhānā uta somaṃ papīyāt, svāśitaḥ punar astaṃ jagāyāt'. Here Thieme thinks that 'the Subjects of a and b (of this Ṛk) are opposed to each other' (. . . .ich glaube, dass die Subjekte von a und b Gegensaetze darstellen) and that this opposition is not 'only indicated here' (der Gegensatz nur angedeutet sei) as Oldenberg thinks[4] but 'directly expressed' (er ist ausgedruckt). In other words he upholds that 'ari' is contrasted with 'śvaśura'

---

1. See Professor Brough's article on the 'Early History of the Gotras' in this connection.
2. Cf Frazer: 'Totemism and Exogamy' (89).
3. L. T. S. 71.
4. Z. D. M. G. 54 and Noten II. 230.

(father-in-law) as the former represents the 'stranger' and the latter 'the near relative (der nahe Verwandte).[1] It seems rather peculiar that both Oldenberg and Thieme should have unnecessarily thought of anti-thetical ideas being presented here, when there is nothing in the context to show that such an idea of contrast was present in the mind of the composer. According to Sāyaṇa 'the wife of Vasukra, the son of Indra praises the latter with this Ṛk' (anayā vasukra-patnīndraṃ stauti) and the occasion is the 'sacrifice performed by Vasukra in which Indra appears masked (and is thus un-noticed) by the wife of Vasukra who desires his presence' (purā vasukre yajñaṃ kurvāṇe sati indraḥ pracchanna-rūpa ājagāma taṃ vasukrapatnīndrāgamana-kaṅkṣiṇī . .). Even in his opinion no opposition is called for here, though he probably misses the significance of 'ari', equating it with 'arya' and giving to it the interpretation 'īśvarah' (lord, implying the other gods—sarva eva devagaṇa ājagāma).[2] Dumézil aptly remarks that it is highly improbable that a stranger having no status should come to a feast which is specially intended for one's own father-in-law[3] Nevertheless, he also fails to see the obvious connection here between 'ari' and 'śvaśura'. There is hardly anything in this verse to suggest that 'viśvo hy anyo ariḥ' refers to 'tout le reste de la communaute aryenne'. On the other hand it is clear that among the 'ari's (i. e. among those who belong to the exogamous group into which she is married) Indra being her father-in-law is her closest relative. There is no sense in thinking 'anyo' to mean—something other than—indra-vyatiriktaḥ' (as Sāyaṇa reads it). The first part of the verse, therefore, should be translated as: 'All the others (comprising) the 'ari' (exogamous group) have come, only my own father-in-law has not come'. The second part of the verse is not relevant for the study of our problem.

Another significant verse is R. V. IX. 79. 3: 'uta svasyā arātyā arir hi ṣa, utānyasyā arātyā vṛko hi ṣaḥ; dhanvan na tṛṣṇā sam-arīta tāṃ abhi, soma jahi pavamāna durādhyaḥ.,'[4]

---

[1] Op. cit. 7.

[2] Cf. Yāska. V. 2. 2.

[3] Op. cit. 119.

[4] I translate the verse:—,Whether he be our own 'arāti'—i. e. he is the 'ari' or whether he be the 'arāti' of another—i. e. he is the wolf, may thirst over come him completely as if in the desert. Conquer, O purifying Soma, the evil-doer.'

The meaning of this verse has long been a matter of controversy, and there is hardly any consensus of opinion regarding the conception of ‘arāti’ specially when it occurs side by side with ‘ari’.[1] At the utmost one can say that a type of enmity or some form of hostile relationship is inevitably associated with ‘arāti’. The above verse, however, is more specific than the others mentioning simply ‘aryaḥ arātīḥ, since it also mentions ‘śva’ (own) and anya’ (connected with others) together with ‘arāti’ and ‘ari’. Here again Thieme has taken pains to show that ‘svasyā arātyā’ and ‘anyasyā arātyā’ should be combined together and understood more or less as an ‘emphatic elaboration’ (emphatische Ausfuehrung) of such an expression as ‘viśvasyā arāteḥ)’ (witeh reference to the ‘arāti’s of all).[2] This hypothesis is certainly untenable as the fact that ‘sva’ and ,anya’ are diametrically opposed to each other cannot be denied, and to lose sight of it or deny it is to mis-interpret the verse wholly. It is none the less true that both the assumptions of Geldner[3] and Dumézil[4] are in no way justifiable. Neither has ‘ari’ anything to do here, with one’s own clan or caste (eigenen Genossenschaft oder Kaste), nor is it cloncerned in any way with ‘L’ensemble des aryens ou l’aryen moyen’ in this context. There is certainly no plausible ground to believe that the evil-doer, if he belongs to the same clan or caste, or even claims similar ethnic origin, should be designated as ‘ari’ while other such persons should be spoken of as ‘wolves’. If, however, we consider ‘ari’ here also, to have the same significance as in the above verse, we can quite understand why it has been equated with ‘one’s own ‘arāti’, whereas the ‘arāti’ with whom no one claims such kinship is designated as the ‘wolf’, which is perhaps the strongest term in the Ṛgveda for one causing harm to others.[5]

Finally among the compounds formed with ‘ari’, ‘aridhāyas’ and ‘aripra’ can also be better explained, once we accept the above sense given to ‘ari’. In R. V. I. 126. 5 alone, ‘aridhāyaso gāḥ’ occurs, to which Thieme gives the interpretation ‘providing

---

1. Thieme has elaborately dealt with these passages (D. F. 45-47).
2. R. V. VIII. 71. 1.
3. Ved. St. III. 91.
4. Op. cit. 118.
5. ‘vrkāyāraye jasuraye’ in VI. 13. 5. seems a curious contradiction.

refreshment for the stranger' (labung fuer den Fremdling habend).[1] It is not improbable that this verse being found in one of the Dānastutis of the Ṛgveda should refer to manifold gifts and among them the poet may have been reminded of the cows as marriage gifts. Naturally, therefore, milked by the ari (in other words milked by the bride-kinsmen) seems preferable to that of Thieme in this context.

With reference to 'aripra' to which usually the meaning 'stainless' (ohne Flecken) is given, Thieme points out in an ingenuous manner that the meaning 'presenting gifts to the stranger' can easily be derived if we construe it as being formed with 'ari' and 'pra' instead of 'a' and 'ripra'.[2] If we accept this derivation[3] it is interesting to note that in R. V. X. 120. 9. 'svasāro' (sisters-here however referring to rivers) are stated to be 'ariprā'.[4] This at once brings to our mind the notion of marriage and in that case 'ariprā' would have to be translated as 'pleasing or fulfilling the wishes of the 'ari'.

From these textual evidences it seems highly probable that 'ari' could have the sociological sense that is proposed here, though it is not finally proved.

---

[1] Op. cit. 24.

[2] Op. cit. 22.

[3] Neither the separating of 'a' and 'ripra' nor that of 'ari' and 'pra' is to be found in the padapāṭha.

[4] 'svasāro 'mātaribhvarīr ariprā hinvanti ca śavasā vardhayanti ca.

CHAPTER II.

'CLAN-EXOGAMY IN THE BRĀHMAṆAS'

In the Brāhmaṇas, which are primarily ritualistic treatises, our position with regard to the question of clan-exogamy is very much similar to that in the Saṃhitās. The ambivalent nature of 'ari' is, as has been stated above, totally lost here and there is hardly any direct reference to the nature of the clan-structure of those days. The words 'jana' and 'jāmi', however, the conception of which is rather vague in the Saṃhitās, attain a more positive signification in these texts in certain contexts. They present an interesting study inasmuch as their special employment in these texts helps us materially in providing evidence pointing to a continuity in the practice of exogamy among clans even in the Brāhmaṇa period. It is clear, as will be seen from the following analysis of these two words, that the former replaces the Ṛgvedic 'ari' and the latter re-presents the antithesis. In this connection it has been found necessary to review some of the relevant occurences of 'jana' and 'jāmi' in the Saṃhitās, as they prepare the ground for a precise connotation being given to them in the Brāhmaṇas.

(*a*)

'JANA'

'Jana' in the Saṃhitās is usually understood by modern scholars to refer to the 'tribe', 'race' or 'clan'. It cannot be denied that such a generic sense alone, can be attached to it in the Ṛgveda. With regard to its derivative 'janya', however, it has become increasingly obvious that a meaning more specific than 'one belonging to a tribe, race or clan' is necessary. Our analysis may, therefore, reasonably begin with a review of such verses in the Ṛgveda in which 'janya' appears.

In R. V. II. 6. 7. and II. 39. 1 'janya' occurs side by side with 'dūta'. 'Dūto janyeva mitryaḥ' in the former is explained by Sāyaṇa as 'janebhyo hito mitryo viśeṣeṇa mitrebhyo hito dūta iva; sa yathā prajānāṃ cittavṛttijñānāya rājñā preritas tāsāṃ mano jānāti tadvat. . .).[1] 'Dūteva havyā janyā purutrā' in the latter, is interpreted by him, taking 'janyā' as a locative form, as 'janapadeṣu dūteva rājñā preṣitau dūtāviva purutrā bahu-bhiḥ puruṣair havyāhvātavyau.[2] Janyāt in VI. 55. 5 (pāt patrijanyāt aṃhaso no mitro mitriyāt) is according to him ,from that (evil) related to men' (janasambandhāt pāpāt). Janyāsa' in IX. 49. 2 (tayā pavasva dhārayā yayā gāva ihāgaman janyāsa upa no bṛhaṃ) is rather significantly taken by him to mean 'belonging to rival settlements'. Geldner on the other hand translates (a) 'janya' in II. 6. 7. and II. 39. 1 as 'matrimonial go-between (Brautwerber)[3]; (b) 'janyāt' in VI. 55. 5 as stranger (Fremde)[4] and (c) 'janyāsa' as 'other people' (anderer Leute).[5] Grassman suggests 'community' (Gemeinde) or 'belonging to the community' (der Gemeinde angehoerig) for most of the verses in which 'janya' occurs, excepting IX. 49. 2 and IV. 38. 6 where agreeing with Geldner, he maintains 'belonging to the foreign people' (fremden Leuten angehoerig) and 'bride's-man (Brautfuehrer) respectively.[6]

That Sāyaṇa is obviously wrong in thinking of the 'royal messenger' in connection with the first two verses, is apparent from the context. In the first instance 'Agni' is distinctly stated as being the intermediary between the two races[7] (antar hy agna īyase vidvān janmobhayā kave), and in the latter there is nothing to indicate that the comparison between the two Aśvins and Dūtas is restricted to the royal emissaries sent to distant lands. With regard to the third verse, it is clear that the commentator has missed the distinction between 'janyād' and 'mitriyāt'. With reference to the last verse his interpretation seems more reasonable, although he fails to arrive at the logical conclusion.

It is therefore more natural to accept Geldner's assumption that the messenger here has to be thought of in the context of matrimony. The point of emphasis lies however in the fact that the 'dūta' belongs particularly to the 'jana' and is friendly (mitriyaḥ) in the sense that, through him, friendly relationship is established between two groups by marriage. That these two groups are exogamous is easily inferred from the next two verses, where the habitual hostility and a feeling of strangeness between them is plainly indicated. It is quite conceivable that the poet invokes Mitra for liberation against oppression caused by one belonging to his own clan (mitriyāt),[1] and Varuṇa[2] for protection against that inflicted by one belonging to a foreign clan with which he has matrimonial connections.[3] Similarly the cows belonging to the 'janya's may aptly be considered as 'bridal gifts' and accordingly Soma is called upon to purify himself in the stream that brings them.[4] Thus even in the Ṛgveda 'janya' seems to convey the idea of 'one belonging to an alien group, presumably exogamous'.

---

[1] 'Friendly towards 'jana's—friendly-well-inclined particularly towards friends like a messenger—i.e. as the messenger sent by the king to know the reactions of the subjects, gets acquainted with them; so also. . . '

[2] "like messengers sent by the king to foreign settlements fit to be summoned by many people".

[3] Der RV. 256 & 295.

[4] Ibid—439.

[5] Der RV. H. O. S. Vol. 35, p. 37.

[6] W. Z. R. 477.

[7] Possibly of 'gods and men'—Cf. Geldner—Der RV. 256. N. 1.

'Janya' in the Atharvaveda[5] is rightly understood by the authors of the Vedic Index[6] to convey the sense of 'bridesmen', and here also the idea of a foreign or alien group is involved.

The Brāhmana portions of the Taittirīya, Kāṭhaka and Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitās of the Black Yajurveda, are generally accepted, with few exceptions, to be earlier than the main bulk of the Brāhmaṇas. Consequently the relevant passages in these may be studied prior to our investigation in the main Brāhmaṇas.

In M. S. I. 4. 9. we find the mantras 'Devān janam agan yajnasya tato mā yajnasy āśīr āgacchatu; Pitṛn janam agan", etc., explained thus: "Devān janam agan yajña iti skannam abhimantrayeta, janaṃ vā etad yajñasya gacchati yatskandati, jano hīyaṃ asmad adhi; yajnasya vā etaj janaṅ gatasy āśiṣam avārundhe. . ." In K. S. 32. 6 we have similarly; "Devān janam agan yajña iti janaṃ vā etad yajñasyaiti yat skandati". 'Janaṃ,' according to the authors of the Vedische Studien has here the sense of either 'foreign People' or foreign land ("zu fremden Volke gehen", "In die Fremde reisen"),[1] Caland also accepts this view in his translation of the Pañcavimsa Brāhmaṇa. Here the Kāṭhaka passage which is simpler and more direct, implies that whatever perishes during the sacrificial performance goes away from the sacrificer, possibly outside his clan.

---

[1] Unfortunately Geldner has not noted this visible difference between 'janyād aṃhasaḥ' and 'mitriyāt aṃhasaḥ'.

[2] According to Sāyaṇa.

[3] One is reminded here of 'svasyā arātyā arir hi ṣa' (See Chap. I).

[4] Cf. ,ari-dhāyaso gāḥ' in the Ṛgveda (see Chap. I).

[5] XI. 10. 1; 2; XIII. 7. 25; XX. 89. 6.

[6] Vol. I.

In the Taittirīya, we come across 'janya' in a more significant context. The passage in question is "Kāmukā enam striyo bhavanti ya evam vedātho ya evaṃ vidvān api janyeṣu bhavati tebhya eva dadātya uta yad bahutayā bhavanti". 6. 1. 6. 6. The context here is the reclaiming of the Goddess Vāk, by the Devas from the Gandharvas with the aid of the Vedic mantras. Sāyaṇa thinks of 'janya's here as 'some relatives of the bridegroom, who are engaged in finding out a suitable bride for him'., "varasya snigdhā varārthaṃ kanyām anveṣṭuṃ pravṛttā bāndhavā janyāḥ". In other words he construes 'janya' in the sense of 'matchmakers' among those who are usually related to the bridegroom, but explaining further, he connects it (janya) with the groom himself, or the group to which he belongs. It is rather peculiar that Sāyaṇa unnecessarily thinks of two imaginary groups of 'janya's when the passage could be explained without using such a device. Keith too, in his translation of the Taittirīya, holds the view that 'janyeṣu' here refers collectively to the family of the grooms. It would probably be better, however, to look upon 'janya' here as a more generic term for the exogamous group into which one marries, as no such specific meaning as Keith proposes, can be given to it in the Brāhmaṇas, though in this passage it fits in with the context.

I translate it therefore as: 'the women become attached to him who knows thus; now, one who knows thus gains superiority[3] over the 'janya's (those belonging to the marria-

---

1. Part II. 334.
2. Among such 'janya's there are two groups; though in one of them there are many grooms (to be) who have other qualities but know not what has been spoken of here, yet the parents give away their daughter to those 'janya's among whom there is but one who knows thus'. (Tādṛśāṇāṃ janyānāṃ dvau vargau. Tatraikasmin varge yathoktavedanarahitā aneka-guṇān-taropetā bahavo varā yadyapi santi tathāpi taṃ vargaṃ upekṣya yeṣu janyesu eko' pyevaṃ vidvān varo bhavati tebhya eva janyebhyaḥ kanyāṃ tat pitaro dādāti).
3. 'Api' with 'bhū' makes better sense as 'gains superiority over'.

geable exogamous group) to him and people like him they give in marriage, even though there are a large number of (such exogamous clans).'

Coming to the main Brāhmaṇas it may be stated ab initio, that 'jana' and 'janya' are used in this special sense mainly in the Pancaviṃśa, Jaiminīya, Taittirīya, Saḍviṃśa and the Śatapatha.

The Pañcaviṃśa perhaps contains the earliest reference to 'jana' and 'janya' in this particular sense. It is in the context of the Viśvajit rite among the Ekāhas, or one-day sacrifices, that the significant term has been used, which has later lead to a lot of difference of opinion among the Sūtrakāras. The Viśvajit is one of the most peculiar ekāhas, where injunctions have been laid down with reference to the sacrificer (yajamāna) as to how he should spend the twleve days symbolic of the Dvādāśāha, which is the Prakṛti (model sacrifice) of which the Vikṛti (sub-ordinate) is the Viśvajit. The injunctions are laid down on the basis of a three-fold division of these twleve days.

In the Pañcaviṃśa XVI. 6., it is laid down that the performer of the Viśvajit rite has to stay in the wilderness for the first three days or nights, among the Niṣādas, for the second three days or nights, amidst the 'janas' for the nextt hree days or nights, and the last three days or nights with the 'samānajanas'. Sāyaṇa with his perfect knowledge of the Sūtras, comments: Vivāhayo g yo' samānagotro brāhmaṇo jana yadvā Rājanyabandhus tasya gṛhe tadīyamannaṃ bhuñjānaḥ'[1] on the P. B. passage 'Jane tisro vasati janyan tābhir annādyam avārundhe' XVI. 6. 8: and 'samāna-gotro janaḥ samānajanaḥ yadvā brāhmaṇamātram tasya gṛhe tadīyamannaṃ, bhunjānas tisro rātrīrvaset',[2] on 'Śamānajane tisraḥ samānajanyan tābhiḥ' XVI. 6. 9. He is obviously quoting here verbatim from Lāṭyayana Śrauta Sūtra where the opinions of Śandilya and Dhānañjayya on 'jana' and 'samānajana' are mentioned, which shall be treated later on. He himsef, admits his borrowing from the Sūtra-kāra (jane tisro vasatītyādivākya-dvayaṃ rājanyaban-

---

1. The Brahman marriageable and not of the same Gotra or Ksatriya eating his food in his place.'

2. 'one of the same' gotra'—he should spend three nights eating his food at his place'.

dhunā brāhmaṇaḥ samānajana iti śāṇḍilya ityādina ūtrakāreṇa bahudhā vyākhyātaṃ). Caland, on the other hand, translates it as 'among a foreign people he dwells (the) three next days. By these he obtains the food of the foreign people; amongst his own people (he dwells the) three (last days of the twelve-day period). By these he obtains the food of his own people'. This view is accepted by most of the Vedic scholars.[1]

It is apparent that the injunctions laid down here refer to the residence of the sacrificer, outside his tribe and clan. For the first six days or nights, he stays in the wilderness, and among the Niṣādas (wild tribes), and hence is separated from his tribe. In the next six days or nights, he gradually comes closer to his own clan. The 'jana's can be thought of here only as 'stranger's to the performer, in the sense that they belong to a different clan, or social group,. The Samānajanas on the other hand, are obviously closer to him than the 'jana's. and as such may represent those who are either closely connected with the performer, or belong to a clan or social group similar to that, with which he is associated. That this is the resonable interpretation here, will be clear later on from the analysis of the more specific injunctions appearing in the Jaiminīya in the same context. The sautra explanations, cited by the commentators cannot, however, he accepted in this context, as they represent a later stage when 'gotra' groupings were being gradually finalized.

In P. B. XVIII. 10. 10., 'jana' again appears in the above sense; 'Yad vai Rājasūyen ābhiṣicyate tat svargaṃ lokam ārohati; sa yad imaṃ lokam nopāvarohed atijanaṃ vāgacched udvā mādyet . .' in the context of the Rājasūya, and Sayaṇa interpreting it as 'svakīya-bandhuvargaṃ' (ones own kith and kin), misses entirely its significance. Caland prefers 'ati-jana' to Sāyaṇa's reading 'ati-gacchet', and translates: 'he would either depart to a (region) which lies beyond (all) human beings'. Neither this emendation nor the translation seems reasonable. Here the alternative, 'behaves like a mad man' (udvā mādyet) shows that 'ati janaṃ vā gacchet' refers to an act which is far from being considerd to be normal' and what could be more unnatural than, going beyond the 'jana's' (i. e.

---

[1] Ved. St. II. 334. Ind. St. X. 16; Rit. Lit. 139 etc

not taking into consideration the 'jana's') in matters connected with matrimony.

In P. B. VI 10. 12 'jana' does probably have the sense of 'foreign settlement' ('Pavasvendo vṛṣā suta iti pratipadaṃ kuryād yaḥ kāmayet me jane ṛdhyeteti'), and Sāyaṇa too explains it as 'janapade' (tribal settlement) which is the nearest approximation to 'foreign land', as the idea of 'janapada' is rather vague in the Brāhmaṇas. The idea of material prosperity of the 'jana's, however, may not be improbable.

Thus in the P. B. which certainly dates to quite an early period among the Brāhmaṇas 'jana' perhaps has the sense of 'foreigners or foreign people', in addition to the sociological meaning suggested above.

Next in importance, comes the Jaiminīya which throws further light on the meaning of 'jana'. In the context of the Viśvajit, the Jainminīya repeats the injunctions laid down in the Pancaviṃśa, and maintains that the sacrificer has to stay with the 'Janas' and 'Sajanas' for the last six nights. It further goes on to explain what is meant by the phrase "staying with the 'janas and Sajanas". The passage runs: "Atha yā jane vased vaiśye vā ha tā bhrātṛvye vā vased; eṣa ha vai brāhmaṇasya jano yad vaiśyo vā bhārtṛvyo vā .... atha yāḥ sajane vased rājani haiva tā vased, etad dha vai sajanaṃ yad rājā". Caland translates thus: ,Die (drei Tage) die, er unter Fremden Leuten zubringt, soll er bei einem Vaiśya, oder bei einem Nebenbuhler zubringen. Der Vaiśya oder der Nobenbuhler ist fuer einem Brahmanen die Fremde; .... Die (drei) die er unter Verwandten zubringt, soll er bei einem Kṣatriya zubringen. Der Kṣatriya ist ja die Anverwandtschaft des Brahmanen, by which he implies that the Vaiśya is a stranger to the Brahman, while the Kṣatriya is related to him. It is true that the passage is of remarkable importance, as it clearly defines the 'jana's and 'sajana's.

It, however, presents a difficulty in stating the 'jana' of the Brahman to be either a Vaiśya or uis rival; and his 'sajana' as being a Kṣatriya. It is almost certain that 'sajana' here is the same as 'samāna-jana' in the Pañca-Viṃśa. The equation of ,jana' with 'rival' is understandable due to hostile relation-

---

1. D. Jb. in A. 179-80.

ship being inevitable between exogamous groups. It must also be pointed out that there is no ground here to think of the Vaiśya as the rival of the Brahman, as it is a case merely of two alternatives being stated. In other words the sacrificer stays either with the 'Vaiśya' or with the ,bhrātṛvya' both being 'jana's. The only way in which the 'Vaiśya'[1] may be thought of as the 'jana' of the Brahman is that he comes from a different social group, and is therefore a stanger. The kṣatriya, on the other hand, comes from a social group similar to that of the Brahman, and is closer to him than the Vaiśya. This possibility is strengthened by the fact that in most of the Brāhmaṇas, the interdependence between the two upper classes is clearly stated.[2] The question whether 'jana' can be considered here as 'asagotra' and 'sajana' as 'sagotra' is irrelevant wih regard to the Vaiśya, and the Kṣatriya who could equally be a 'sagotra' or 'asagotra' of the Brahman. Thus in this passage, 'jana' appears in the sense of the 'stranger' as well as the 'member of the exogamous group'.

In the Taittirīya we come across another highly interesting passage in which 'janya' is used in an unusual manner. In the context of the Rajasūya, with special reference to the Abhiṣeka (sprinkling) ceremony performed by the Adhvaryu, it is stated in I. 7. 8. 7., that the Adhvaryu performs the Abhiṣeka with the branch of the Parṇamaya for the Brahman to impart spiritual lustre to the performer, with that of the Udumbara the Rājanya to endow him with strength, with that of the Aśvattha the Vaiśya to add to his material prosperity and with that of the Nyagrodha the 'janya', so that he may win friends (Parṇamayen ādhvaryur abhiṣincati. Brahma-varcasamevāsmin tviṣim dadhāti Āśvatthena vaiśyah viśāṃ evāsmin puṣṭiṃ dadhāti; Naiyagrodhena janyaḥ mitrāṇyev āsmai kalpate). 'Janya' here is rather curiously placed. The commentator Bhaṭṭabhāskaramiśra vainly tries to explain it as referring to either 'royal adversary' or ,friendly people' (prati-rāja ity eke mitrajana ity anye). According to the context we should expect here the term 'śūdra' instead of 'janya' but that is not sufficient ground for maintaining that a 'śūdra' is meant here, though the

---

[1] cf. Kausitaki. XXV.

[2] See Chap. IV.

Baudhāyana Śruata Sūtra perhaps does conform to this view as shall be seen later on. The connection of the Śūdra with the bringing in of friends cannot be understood. Probably the sense of ‘janya’ here is the same as in R. V. II. 6. 7.—,dūto janyeva mirtryaḥ’.

The ‘janya’ then being the member of the exogamous group to which the kṣatriya performer does not belong, would naturally be placed last in the list. ‘Mitrāṇi’ again would also refer to contractual friends, in other words the bridekinsmen who would eventually maintain amicable relationship with the groom who in this context is the performer himself.

The Ṣaḍviṃśa also has ‘jana’ and ‘janya’ in precisely the same sense as in the Pancaviṃśa. In 1. 7. 3 in the context of the eating of the remains of the Soma gruel (saumyātiśeṣaprāśana) it is mentioned that the food not taken by one who is capable of eating it, goes from him to ‘jana’. In that it goes to the Pitṛs (ancestirs) he eats, through the consuming of the ‘janya’ food.[1] Sāyaṇa takes ‘jana’ in the sense of men, and interprets; “The Udgātā should eat the remains of the Soma gruel offered. By eating this the food reaches that person who does not consume it, though he is capable of it. Moreover, the Manes are also pleased by this consumption of food. Thus by eating food conducive to people, he partakes as if of the same gruel, i.e. he eats inasmuch as he is capable to eat. He enjoys food not only here, but also in the other world”.[2] This explanation does not suit the context. The phrase ‘Jano’ smātpitaro’ should be construed separately, and the consuming of ,janya’ food meant for the manes (pitṛ) should be considered as leading to the nourishment of the yajamāna (sacrificer). Kurt Klemm in his German translation adheres to the view of Sāyaṇa, but Eelsing’s note on ‘jana’ reads differently. (‘jana’ betekent hier de vreemde mensen...De zin van de passage van janaṃ af is Waarschijnlik;" 'naar den vreemde voor waar, gaat 't voedsel van hemweg; die of schoon hij in staat is voedsel te gebruiken, toch geen voedsel eet; 't vreemde zijn voor hem (?) de Manes. Juist door de voor die vreemden bestemde spijs, eet hij spijs, wondt hij spijseter").[1] The Manes are spoken of as 'Jana' or strangers to the Yajamāna, being inhabitants of the other world and this is perhaps the basis of 'janya' food being considered suitable for the Pitṛs and not recommended for the Brahman in some of the Brāhmaṇa texts. It is in this strain that Hauer in his book on the Vrātya (Der Vrātya) translates 'janyam annam adanti' in P. B. 17. 1. 9, as 'eating the food of families[2] suitable for the Mane's as the food for the Brahman (Brahmādyaṃ). It is significant that such a conception of the stranger is not unknown to the Brāhmaṇas, though it is totally absent in the Ṛgveda.

---

[1] ‘yo’ lam annādyāya sann athānnaṃ nādyād dakṣiṇārdhaṃ sadaso gatvā etaṃ saumyātiśeṣaṃ prāśnīyāj janaṃ vā etasmād annādyaṃ krāmati yo’ lam annādyāya sann athānnaṃ nātti jano’ smāt pitaro janyenaiv ānnenānnam atty annādo bhavati (1. 7. 3).

[2] etaṃ saumyātiśeṣaṃ hutaśiṣṭaṃ saumyaṃ caruṃ prāśnīyād udgātā; tasmād bhakṣaṇād annādyaṃ taṃjanaṃ krāmati prāpnoti yo jano’nnādyāya samarthaḥ sann api annaṃ nātti, kiñca asmāt prāśanāt pitaro’pi tṛptā bhavantīti śeṣaḥ; ato janyena janahitenānnena bhakṣaṇāt saumyenaivātti; ...na kevalaṃ iha loke kiṃ tu paratrāpy annādo bhavatīti.

Lastly coming to the Śatapatha, we find still some passages in which undoubtedly 'jana' occurs in both the senses stated above.

In XIV. 4. 1. 11, 'Tasmānna janamīyān nāntam īyāt 'janaṃ' certainly stands for foreign lands. Sāyaṇa too, comments on it as 'Antyajanaṃ' (V. S. II. p. 334). In V. 3. 3. 12, "Mahate jānarājyāyeti mahate janānāṃ rājyāya ity evaitad āhendrasya . ." the overlordship of the 'janas' does not only refer to people at large but also specifically to people inhabiting foreign lands. Sāyaṇa understands by it, a veritable paramountcy (janasambandhi yadrājyaṃ tatra sāgaraparyanta-bhūmi-viṣayatvāt mahat-sārvabhaumatvāya). In 14. 9. 2. 5. 'Yō ha vā āyatanaṃ veda āyatanaṃ svānāṃ bhavaty āyatanaṃ janānāṃ' the distinction between 'sva' (own clan) and 'jana's without doubt lies between members of one's own clan and members of the other exogamous clans into which one marries.

Thus it is clear from the above passages that side by side with the general sense of the stranger and foreign lands the special meaning of the marriageable exogamous group (which is the same as given to the Ṛgvedic 'ari') was also given to 'jana' by the authors or redactors of the Brāhmaṇa texts. It is all the more interesting to note that even in the period of the Sūtras this importance of 'jana' was not yet lost, as will be evident from the following brief review of some passages in the main Śrauta Sūtras, though this conception of exogamous grouping was gradually being more standardized with the emergence of a full-fledged gotra system.

---

[1] "'Jana' means here the foreign people . . . The meaning of the passage starting with 'jana' is probably—to the stranger indeed the food goes away from him; although he is capable of taking food, yet does not consume it—The stranger is for him (?) the Manes. Through that food destined for the stranger, he eats food, he becomes a food-consumer."

[2] Geschlechterspeise—p. 69. Cf. Aitareya Br. 1. 3. 10. 6. See also Chap. V.

[3] See Chap. I.

Among the Śrauta Sūtras the main ones which seem to carry reminiscenses of the older conception of 'Jana' mention may be made of Āpastamba, Baudhāyana, Lāṭyāyana and Kātyāyana.

Commenting on IX. 11. 4. in Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra in the context of Prāyaścittas—'Etaṃ jane pramītasya' the commentator observes significantly—'Jane pramītasya deśāntare mṛtasya' by which he implies that 'Jana' here must refer to 'foreign country'.

In Baudhāyana XII. 9. in the context of the Rājasūya the use of the term 'janyāya' is akin to that in the Taittirīya version—(naiyagrodhena janyāya prāyacchat) though the vivaraṇa of Bhāvasvāmin commenting on it, equates it with Śūdra.[1]

The most conspicuous passage is, however, that found in the Lāṭyāyāna Śr. Sūtra. In Lat. Sr. S. 8. 2. 10-12 the opinions of ancient commentators are cited with reference to the terms 'jana' and sajana or 'samāna jana' in the context of the Viśvajit, 'Jane tisro vasatīti Rājanyabandhur jano brāhmaṇaḥ samāna jana iti śāṇḍilyaḥ; vivāhyo janaḥ sagotraḥ samānajana iti Dhānañjayaḥ; Prativeśo janapadaḥ jano yatra vaset sa samānajana iti sāṇḍilyāyanaḥ).[2] The views here cited of these three ancient commentators, show the gradual change in the conception of 'jana'.

It is interesting to note that Śāṇḍilya proposes an equation different from that found in the Jaiminīya, while Dhānañjaya

---

1. Cf. Caland's edition—61.
2. "'According to Śāṇḍilya the Kṣatriya is 'jana', the Brāhmaṇa 'samānajana', according to Dhānañjaya, 'one worthy of marriage is 'jana' and 'one having the same Gotra i.e. samānajana. With Śāṇḍilyāyana a neighbouring principality is 'jana''.

is referring to a more modern opinion and Śāṇḍilyāyana does not take notice of the sociological significance of 'jana'.

Kātyāyana too, equates Vaiśya with 'Jana' and Rājanya with 'samānajana' in the context of the Viśvajit- "Vaiśyo jano Rājanyaḥ samānajanāḥ śruteḥ" reminiscent of the Jaiminīya (II. 183-184) without further comment.

Lastly the Anupadam 4. 12 also states 'lokavad vaiśyo jano, rājanyaḥ samanajanaḥ' which confirms the Jaiminīya version.

'JĀMI'

The search for the basic conception of 'jāmi' in the Brahmaṇas has long been a matter of vital importance to scholars and has also led to a lot of difference in interpretation among the ancient commentators. To most of the modern scholars it has not been very clear what the word signifies outside the sphere of rituals, though a type of relationship seems to them to be inevitably associated with it.

Needless to say it conveys some type of kinship even as early as the age of the Ṛgveda, and perhaps the emphasis lies on blood-connection in passages where it occurs as accompanied with (svasā) sister.[1] but in the Mantras where it signifies simply relationship or in those where by itself it appears to convey the sense of 'sister', it is not probably the blood-relationship which is so much stressed (as maintained by Keith and Macdonell and Delbruck), as the difference in social grouping which is seen from the following analysis of Yāska, who, as is known, dates back to quite an early period and as such reliable.

In Nirukta II.6. and IV. 20 Yāska attempts an etymological analysis of 'jāmayaḥ' occuring in the following mantras of the Ṛgveda: (1) "*Na jāmaye tānvo rikthaṃ āraik cakāra garbhaṃ sanitur nidhānam, yadi mātaro janayanta bahnim anyaḥ kartā sukratoranya ṛndhan*" (III. 31. 2.) and (2) *Ā ghā tā gacchān uttarā yugāni yatra jāmayaḥ kṛṇvann ajāmi. Upa barbṛhi vṛṣabhāya bāhumanyam icchasva subḥage pati mat.*[2] (X. 10. 10) Thus he says "not to 'jāmi' i.e. sister—(as) the child (jā) is procreated in her by others (or) from the root 'jam' meaning 'to go' (as) she nearly goes out (from her family)" (na jāmaye bhaginyai jāmir anye 'syāṃ janayanti jām apatyaṃ jamatervā syād gati-karmaṇo nirgamana-prāyā bhavati),[3] in the context of the first mantra. Explaining the second one he says: "'jāmi' is the designation, for superfluity or the dull-headed or one belonging to a dissimilar (social) group" —jāmy atirekanāma, bāliśasya vāsamāna-jātīyasya). From the first analysis it is clear that according to him 'jāmi' should either be derived from 'jan'—'to create or procreate' or 'jam'—'to go'. Based on this derivation it would refer to 'sister' as others (husbands belonging to different families) 'procreate in her' or because 'she usually goes out of her family (to the family of her husband). From the next interpretation it is deducible that in his opinion 'jāmi' is either connected with redundancy, stupidity or social grouping. It is clear, therefore, that Yāska does not attach much importance to blood-relationship, and even in the sense of 'sister' the etymological derivation refers to the conjugal relationship between the husband and wife leading to the abandonment of her natural connection with her own family, rather than the blood-kinship existing between brother and sister. What Yāska precisely means by 'Asamāna-jātīya' is not clear and Durga's comment[1] on it is not very illuminating. One would naturally expect 'samāna-jātīya' in this context. It must be noted here that the word 'jāmi' has all the three forms (mas. fem. and neuter) even in the Ṛgveda, the first two having little difference in meaning and the last one being mostly used to convey 'relationship' in general.

---

[1] Cf. V. I. I. 284, W.Z. R. 484, D. I. V. 463.—Renou-J. A. 1939-209.

[2] Cf. Av. 18. 1. 11.

[3] Cf. Yadvā jamati gacchati svotpatti-sthānād anyatreti—Sāyaṇa on R. V. 1. 123. 5.

Sāyaṇa on the other hand has even a third way of deriving 'jāmi' from 'jam' to eat (jamū adane) and understands by it 'relations eating food together', (jamanti sahaikasmin pātre 'dantīti jamāyo bāndhavāḥ) but this conjecture seems rather far-fetched.

There is however one instance in the Ṛgveda in which 'jāmi' in all possibility conveys a more specific sense. In III. 54. 9—*'sanā purāṇaṃ adhyemy ārān; mahaḥ pitur janitur jāmi tan naḥ'*[2] clearly indicates that 'jāmi' refers to a type of kinship based on common descent. (Cf. Sāyaṇa: 'sarvam ekasmāj jātaṃ').[3]

---

[1] Durgā—'puruṣasya bhaginy-ākhyo bhrātā' ('the brother of a man, known as sister'). He probably implies that a difference in sex is meant and he uses 'bhrātā' in the sense of 'related by blood.'

[2] "From afar I recognize the primeval one. That is the relationship between us (in so far as) we are descended from the great father, the, procreator."

[3] It is rather peculiar that Sāyaṇa interprets pituḥ' as 'pālayitryāḥ, thinking it to be a feminine form,

In the White Yajurveda 'jāmi' has the same sense as in the Ṛgveda since the mantras are the same. In the Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā, the contrast between 'jāmi' and 'ajāmi' is found- in XIII. 13: *'Ava sthirā tanūhi yātujūnāṃ jāmim ajāmiṃ pramṛṇīhī śatrūn'*[1] which Mahīdhara explains thus : 'the words 'jāmi' and 'ajāmi' express 'repetition' and 'non-repetition': doing it 'jāmi'—i.e. repeatedly and 'ajāmi'—i.e. 'without repetition', beaten repeatedly or not beaten' (jāmyajāmi-śabdau punaruktā-punaruktavacanau jāmim ajāmim punaruktaṃ apunaruktaṃ kṛtvā punaḥ punastāḍitam atāḍitaṃ vā). That Mahīdhara is influenced by the ritualistic interpretation of 'jāmi' is clear, as this is the usual sense given to it in the Brāhmaṇas. It should, however, be understood here as in the Ṛgveda (IV. 4. 5, X. 116. 5) in the sense of 'related' and contrasted with 'ajāmi' conveying the idea of 'not related'. This relation does not necessarily emphasize blood-connection as understood by Grassman (blutsverwandt, verwandt und subst. Verwandter, gewoenlich mit dem Gegensatze ajāmi).

In the Kāṭhaka, Maitrāyaṇī and Taittirīya recensions of the Black Yajurveda, we do not come across any other conception of 'jāmi'.

In the Atharvaveda, we do find some passages which throw some light on the significance of 'jāmi', apart from its ritualistic importance in the sense of 'redundancy' or 'addition'.

A. V. I. 17. 1. mentions 'jāmayaḥ' with 'abhrātara' (brotherless), though in the Paippalāda recension we have yoṣāḥ (woman) instead, and 'jāmayaḥ' in place of 'yoṣito' in the second part of the verse.[2] Perhaps the connection of 'jāmayaḥ' with 'abhrātaraḥ' is more appropriate as 'jāmi' apprehended in its specific sense renders the verse more intelligible than the common appellative 'yoṣit' for the female. The Mantra thus accepted runs:

> *'amūr yā yanti yosito hirā (var. sārvā) lohitavāsasaḥ*
> *abhrātara iva jāmayas tiḥthantu hatavaracasaḥ.'*

Delbruck translates this as: "Those women, the others, who are dressed in red, should keep silent, robbed of their strength, as sisters without brothers". That 'jāmayaḥ' apparently

---

1. Cf. T. S. I. 2. 14. 2; M. S. 2. 7. 15; KS. 16. 15.
2. Cf. Nir. III. 4.
3. D. I. V. 463. Jene Weiber, die Andern, die da rothgekleidet sind, sollen still stehen, ihrer Kraft beraubt, wie Schwestern ohne Bruder,

conveys the sense of 'sisters' is undeniable, though Sāyaṇa unnecessarily extends the sense (striyaḥ bhaginyādirupāḥ). The epithet 'abhrātara', however, which probably signifies in this context 'without brothers within the clan' leads us to a possible conjecture that the reference here might be to women belonging to a non-marriageable group. In that case the situation is natural that such women being confined to their own clan would owe their sustenance to their brothers within the clan,[1] in the absence of whom they would be deprived of all claims to any social status, within or without the clan. Yāska again, quoting the Mantra in the context of 'the brotherless theory' (abhrātṛmatī- vāda) perhaps implies a similar situation.

In A. V. XVIII. 1. 4. the appearance of the neuter form 'jāmi' is significant. The verse is already seen in the Ṛgveda in the famous Yama-Yamī dialogue-hymn. (X. 10. 4). It has "*gandharvo, psv apyā ca yoṣā sā no nābhiḥ paramaṃ jāmi tannau* ".[2] There seems here to be a logical continuation of the idea already expressed in III. 54. 9 (quoted above) and as such 'jāmi' must be construed in the sense of 'kinship through common descent'. The context here is relevant as it refers to the non-practicability of marital-relationship between close relations. Sāyaṇa too, interprets 'jāmi' as 'bāndhavaṃ' and adds that 'Yama suggests the impropriety of such an act, which is tantamount to approaching (for marriage) the unmariageable (woman)'.

In the principal Brāhmaṇas we find 'jāmi' gradually brought into the sphere of rituals and means mostly "duplication", which is considered to be one of the errors in the actual performance of certain rituals. Still there are a few passages in some of the comparatively older Brāhmaṇa texts, wherein undoubtedly the word has a sociological significance.

Among these passages the notable ones are found in the Taittirīya and Jaiminīya respectively.

'Jāmyai' in the Taittirīya I. 7. 2. 6—'*Bahu vai rājanyo*

---

[1] The absence of such brothers would imply the absence of any relation with those outside the clan.

[2] "The Gandharva (Āditya) in the firmament (acc. to Sāyaṇa) and the woman (Saraṇyu, the wife of Āditya) residing in the same (firmament); to her we owe our birth (literally navel) that is our closest relationship."

[3] 'āvayor agamyā-gamana-rūpatvāt kartum ayuktaṃ tasmād etan na karomīty abhiprāyaḥ'.

'nṛtaṃ karoti : upa jāmyai harate, jināti brāhmaṇam, vadaty anṛtam, anṛte khalu krīyamāṇe varuṇo gṛhṇati", presents a knotty problem and has led to variance in interpretation among ancient exegetes, as will be clear from the following opinions cited by Bhaṭṭabhāskara Miśra in his commentary. He takes 'anṛtaṃ' or 'untruth' as symbolic of evil, and explains the contempt for the Rājanya or warrior thus; 'ahite praṇayaṃ prayacchati i.e. 'takes to evil deeds' or 'falls in for something harmful'. He further says that "some understand 'jāmi' as referring to 'sister' "(Bhaginīty eke). According to others it means 'loss of vitality'; 'sloth', 'death' and the passage implies that 'the Rājanya with a view to kill someone, offers money (gifts) to one, with whom he intends to enter into alliance'.[1] He suggests another alternative referring to some who interpret it as 'the Rājanya sends money (gifts to some) thinking 'I could be indifferent for the present.'[2] Still others say, according to him, that "jāmi' refers to the 'wife' (jāyā), and that the dative is used here in the sense of the accusative (implying) that the Rajanya presents his wife to another or approaching another's wife carries her away and leaves someone (his wife)".[3] It is evident from these citations that Bhaṭṭabhāskara Miśra is not certain about the proper sense of 'jāmyai' in this context.

Sāyaṇa however, is more positive as far as the rendering of 'jāmyai' in this passage is concerned. Thus commenting on Taittirīya Saṃhitā I. 8.3. he quotes the above passage and adds: "the Kṣatriya (warrior) does much that has no sanction of the Śāstras (ritual texts), or goes against them, like, carrying away (by force) the wife of some other one in order to make her his own; in other words approaching someone's house runs away with his wife."[4]

A knowledge of the context here is absolutely essential to arrive at the precise connotation of 'jāmyai' used in a rather unusual manner. It is in the context of the Rājasūya that this passage occurs, and refers to the lauding of the presiding deity (Varuṇa) during the performance of the last of the six ritualistic duties concerned with single offerings; (cf. Sāyaṇa: eka-haviṣke ṣaṣṭhe karmaṇi devatāṃ praśaṃsati). The earlier conception of Varuṇa as the upholder of Ṛta or satya (truth) is also maintained here, and the fear of being a victim to the mighty noose of Varuṇa is hinted at. The contempt is purposely shown towards a Rājanya or Kṣatriya as he is the performer of the Rājasūya.

---

[1] jāḍyaṃ ālasyaṃ maraṇaṃ; kañcit mārayituṃ kasmaicid abhisaṃdhitsayā dhanaṃ upāharati.

[2] Yadvā idānimudāstavyam iti dhanaṃ preṣayati.

[3] (apara āha jāmir jāyā karmaṇi caturthī; bhāryām api kasmaicid upaharate, yadvā parasya bhāryām upetya apaharati kiñca kṣipati).

[4] bahu vai rājanyo rājanyaḥ ksatriyo bahuvidham anṛtam aśāstrīyaṃ karoti yathā jayāyai jāmyai jāyātvaṃ sampādayitum upaharate: yasya kasyacit gṛham upetya striyaṃ harati.

Now the two other forms of misconduct with reference to the Rājanya are mentioned as the vanquishing of a Brahman, and the utterance of false-hood (brāhmaṇaṃ jināti, anṛtaṃ vadati) which indicate that the phrase 'upa jāmyai harate' refers to some act of the Kṣatriya which was considered to be as heinous as the other two which we know for certain were looked upon by the Brahman with great contempt. It needs hardly mentioning that in spite of many passages attesting to the contrary, the supremacy of the priestly caste was well challenged by the warrior class in the age of the Brāhmaṇas, and speaking truth which was considered to be one of the essential preliminaries for those who intended to perform sacrifices, was hardly ever associated with those who gave themselves up to the use of violence and diplomacy.

Thus accepting that there is a statement here of some sinful practice of the Kṣatriya, it may be suggested that the dative of 'jāmi' here presents no difficulty and it is baseless to construe it in the sense of the accusative (Karmaṇi caturthī) as understood by Bhaṭṭabhāskara. Further no importance can be attached to the use of 'hṛ' in the Ātmanepada (which sometimes conveys the sense 'to accept' with 'upa'), as such verbal particulars are not frequent in the Brāhmaṇas. The necessity for breaking 'upaharate' into 'upetya harate'[1] consequently does not arise.

Śāyaṇa's interpretation of 'jāmi' as 'jāyā' certainly goes against the evidence gathered from the Saṃhitās and may be voicing a much later tradition. Our analysis of the Vedic mantras has shown that 'jāmi' represents the 'woman belonging to the non-marriageable group', or 'kinship within the clan'. The 'jāyā' or wife on the other hand, comes from the exogamous group. It might be conjectured however, that 'jāmi' limited in the sense of 'sister' at a later period was allowed to become the 'jāyā' or wife of another, and this partial notion may have led to the later conception of 'jāmi' as 'jāyā'.

---

[1] cf. Sāyaṇa quoted above.

The same is true with the citations of Bhaṭṭabhāskara. None of them seem to clarify the sense of 'jāmi' , further than that of the 'sister'. The distinction between 'jāyā' and 'jāmi' is again unnoticed. 'Upa jāmyai harate' therefore has to be explained more reasonably as 'presents gifts to 'jāmi'.[1] Now, 'jāmi', if we have correctly analysed the Saṃhitā references, especially in its feminine form refers to the female within the clan and as such non-marriageable. It is therefore fairly reasonable to infer that the misconduct of the Kṣatriya here, has some connection with the violation of the rules of matrimony. Thus the interpretation that naturally comes to our mind is that the Kṣatriya makes a presentation of gifts to such women obviously with a view to enter into sexual communion with them, and thus transgresses the rule of exogamy. In other words, these gifts are in fact love-gifts, the presentation of which, in the act of wooing has been noted as a common practice even among the primitive tribes.[2] In an exogamous society even such illict connections are thinkable only in the context of women belonging to separate clans. Consequently the Kṣatriya is doubly guilty of attempting to approach the unapproachable woman for marriage, and also presenting her love-tokens for illicit purposes. It is apparent that such an act would be considered as an unpardonable sin by the Brahmans of those days strongly adhering to the exogamous system.

Again in the context of the Puruṣamedha, we come across another passage in the Taittirīya, where 'jāmi' is contrasted with 'kumārī'—(*āśāyai jāmiṃ pratīkṣāyai kumārīṃ*—III. 4. 19. 1). The understanding of this passage too, has been a matter of controversy among commentators. Sāyaṇa curiously enough, interprets 'jāmi' in a sense which can hardly be deemed proper in this context. 'Jāmi', Sāyaṇa interprets here as "any woman" who is going through her period of menopause, or who is incapable of rendering sexual satisfaction." (nivṛttarajaskāṃ bhogāyogyāṃ striyaṃ). 'Jāmi' being mentioned among the Puruṣamedha victims, and especially before 'kumārī', provides the basis probably for Sāyaṇa to think of the sexually incapable middle-aged female, but no such inference can plausibly be drawn from the passage as it stands. Bhaṭṭabhāskara on the other hand is more logical and quotes the views of others: (a) 'according to some it refers to a woman married (forcibly) by someone other than the one to whom she is given in marriage' (anyennoḍhā anyasmai dattā); (b) "others maintain; a widow" (vidhave tyapare) (c) still others hold; 'one (woman) who enjoys "jāmitva" (d) deprived of (social) rights (yā nivṛttādhikārā jāmitvaṃ bhajate); and lastly married daughter (cf. ūḍhaduhite-ty apare). Among these, the first two opinions cited, are certainly based on later conceptions, as there is hardly any instance in the Brāhmaṇas of 'jāmi' conveying the sense of 'an abducted woman' or 'a widow', but the next two merit consideration. The idea of a married daughter, is perhaps based on an obvious contrast between 'jāmi' and 'kumārī' but misses the significance of 'jāmi' as far as marriageable groups are concerned. Even in the Brāhmaṇas the social rights and priveleges enjoyed by a daughter when married are those borrowed from her husband, and as such 'jāmi', according to this interpretation, would be identical with 'jāyā', a conception which, as has been pointed out above is contrary to what is basically conveyed by 'jāmi'. The third inference is rather vague, though more cogent if by 'adhikāra' is meant matrimonial rights.

---

[1] The view of Monier Williams (Skt. Dic.) that 'jāmi' is the name of a deity cannot be accepted, as it is a later conception.

[2] I owe this remarkable suggestion to my supervisor Professor Brough.

A sense of propriety between the deity related to 'Āśā' (hope) and that connected with 'Pratīkṣā' (expectation), and the two victims 'jāmi' and 'kumārī' respectively, seems inferrable though not inevitable. The commentators explain 'Āśā' and 'Pratīkṣā' as referring to desiring an unobtainable object, and expecting the attainment of something obtainable respectively.[1]

If we accept these derivations, it seems possible to understand the difference between 'jāmi' and 'kumārī' on the basis of the distinction between these two deities. Thus 'jāmi' being the woman who belongs to the non-marriageable group would be hoping to acquire the unattainable, if she desired to be

[1] āśāyai alabhya-vastu-viṣayatṛṣṇābhimāninyai pratīkṣāyai labdhavyasya vastunā lābhapratīkṣaṇ-ābhimāninyai).

wedded into an exogamous clan. On the other hand, the maiden (kumārī) would naturally expect an exogamous marriage.

The rendering 'unmarried sister' is possible, but does not bring out the fundamental idea underlying 'jāmi'.

Another passage in the Taittirīya, in the context of Agniṣṭoma, the mantras for expiation, necessary for the errors commited during the performance of the new and fullmoon sacrifices (darśa-pūrṇa-māsa) are cited in which 'jāmiśaṃsa' is stated as an alternative for 'sajātaśaṃsa'.[1] 'Jāmi' is taken by Sāyaṇa here again to refer to 'wives' whilst 'Sajāta' conveys the idea of relatives or frineds. (samāna-janmāno jnātayaḥ samāna-vayaskāḥ sakhāyo vā sajātān, jāmayaḥ jāyāḥ bhāryāḥ), but as we have held above this is a later interpretation of 'jami' and as such even in this passage the word should be taken to refer to a distinct social group. The connotation of Sajāta, as we shall see later on, cannot be limited to relatives claiming equal parentage. The only difference between the two is, probably, that while the former belongs to a much wider group comprised of one's fellows, the latter is restricted to those with whom one cannot contract marriage.

Passing on to the Jaiminīya, we come across an interesting passage, where the use of 'jāmi' is revealing. In III. 197 while explaining the origin of the Jarābodhīya melody, the legend of the dalliance of Gaurivīta with the daughter of the Asura Asita Dhāmnya is narrated. In this connection it is stated that as a result of this illicit relation with Gaurivīta, the unmarried daughter of the Asuras became pregnant, and a son was born to her. But he was torn asunder and thrown away by the Asuras, who said: 'This forsooth is the fruit of a sister, it is an ogre that has been born there..[2] ('bruvan; jāmigarbho vā ayaṃ; rakṣo vā idam ajanīti). Here it is perhaps the conceiving of a maiden through one not belonging to the exogamous group into which she could be eventually married. It is certainly not only the rivalry of Asita Dhāmnya with the Gandharvas, but also the fact that this offspring is the result of an illicit relationship and the more so specially when it is between non-marriageable partners, that leads the Asuras to discliam the child and destroy it. The phrase 'rakṣo idam ajani' is indicative of their wrath. It is however, not suggested here that the above passage provides evidence for the non-acceptance by society of children whose parents were unmarried, but on the other hand it cannot be denied that using the significant word 'jāmi' it empahsizes the social contempt for such an illegitimate union. 'Jāmi-garbha' compared with 'rakṣo' (ogre) shows how strongly the impropriety of such an occurence was felt.

---

[1] (sajātaśaṃsād uta vā jāmiśaṃsāt, jyāyasaḥ śaṃsād uta vā kanīyasaḥ III, 7. 12. 2.—also M. S. IV. 14. 17).

[2] According to Caland's Trans. of the P. V. (Note 2 on XIV. 5. 28).

Another illuminating passage in the Jaiminīya is probably I. 300, which throws light on the meaning of the Neuter 'jāmi' and 'ajāmi'. In the context of the four melodies (saman)—(1) svara, (2) idhanvat, (3) ṛksāma, (4) ailaṃ, it is stated that, 'Jāmi' is that which is contrary to sexual relationship and procreation, whilst ,ajāmi' is that which is in agreement with such conditions. To illustrate, the basis of this conjecture, the absurdity of perverted relationship between males and also females is brought out. It is not however that merely a distinction between 'jāmi' and 'ajāmi' on the basis of natural and unnatural sex-relationship is stressed but also the fact that no union by marriage is possible with the 'jāmi', whereas with 'ajāmi' it is normal. In other words, 'jāmi' represents a group totally different from that which is formed up by the 'ajāmi'.[1] It is, however, true that what is mainly emphasized here is 'sameness' and 'dissimilarity' with referrence to 'jāmi' and 'ajāmi' respectively.

Lastly we may deal with the famous passage in the Aitareya, which has attracted the attention of most Vedic scholars.[2]

Here 'jāmi' (of the gods. i.e. Rākā) is set aside in favour of the 'devānāṃ patnīḥ'—the wives of the gods, in the context of the lauding of the wives of gods, (patnīśaṃsana) during the performance of the Agnihotra. It is stated that "the performer" (of the Agnihotra) then lauds the wives of the Gods after Agni the 'gṛhapati'. Thus the wife (of the performer) sits behind the Gārhapatya fire. They say 'Rākā' should be formerly lauded, as the primary drink is for the 'jāmi'; but one should not pay heed to it; he should first of all laud the wives of gods—this indeed, that is Agni Gārhapatya, puts the seed into the wives of the Gods; verily through the Gārhapatya fire, he puts seed into his wives. He who knows this, thrives with children and cattle. Therefore, the sister from the same womb lives under the patronage of the wife from another womb: "devānāṃ patnīḥ śaṃsaty anūcīr agniṃ, gṛhapatiṃ tasmād anūcī patnī gārhapatyam āste; tad āhuḥ Rākāṃ purvaṃ śaṃset, jāmyai vai pūrvapeyam iti, tat tan nādṛtyaṃ devānāṃ eva patnīḥ purvāḥ śaṃset, eṣa ha vā etat patnīṣu reto dadhāti yad agnir gārhapatyaḥ, agninaivāsu tad gārhapatyena patnīṣu pratyakṣād reto dadhāti prajātyai; prajāyate prajayā paśubhir ya evaṃ veda; tasmāt samānodaryā svasānyodaryāyai jāyāyā anujīvinī jīvati."[1] According to Delbruck 'jāmi' here refers to 'sister', but as the equation with 'svasā' in the later portion of the passage, can only be maintained (in his opinion) in the context of the sister, while she lives in her brother's house, it would probably be better to take 'jāmi' in the sense of unmarried sister'. Delbruck further argues that the injunction with regard to the right of the sister to have the first drink may be either an individual opinion or a statement of a usage. He is, however, inclined to accept the latter (Das kann lediglich seine Ueberlegung sein, kann sich aber auch auf einen Gebrauch stuetzen. Ich nehme das letztere......)[2] It is, however, apparent that 'jāmyai vai pūrva-peyaṃ iti, is, merely one of those stock phrases so frequent in the Brāhmaṇas, which

---

[1] 'amithunaṃ tad aprajananaṃ yaj jāmi; yathā pumāṃso vā saha śayātāṃ striyau vā; kiṃ pumāṃsau saha śayānau prajanayetāṃ; kiṃ striyau, tau cen mithunīkartāraṃ no labheyātāṃ; atho yad evājāmi tanmithunaṃ tat prajananaṃ'.

[2] V. I. 1. 285—D. I. V. 464.

[3] III. 37. 1. cf. Sāyaṇa—'devānāṃ jāmiḥ'.

---

1. Cf. Delbruck—Op. cit. "d.l. er richtet einen Spruch an die Gattinnen der Goetter nach dem Agni Gṛhapati deshalb sitzt die Gatin (des Opferers) hinter dem Gārhapatya-Feuer. Man wendet freilich ein; er richte zuerst einen Spruch an Rākā, denn der Schwester, gebuehrt der Vortrunk. Aber darauf nehme man keine Ruecksicht, vielmehr richte er zuerst den Spruch an die Gattinnen der Goetter. Agni Garhapatya legt auf diese Weise Samen in die Gattinnen und so legt auch der Opferer durch den Agni Gārhapatya offenbar Samen in die (menschlichen) Gattinnen zur Fortpflanzung. Wer dieses weiss, pflanzt sich fort an Nachkommenschaft und Vieh. Deshalb lebt eine Schwester (naemlich wenn sie im Hause ihres Bruders lebt), die dochaus demselben Mutterleibe stammt, als Untergebene der Gattin welche aus einem andern Mutterleibe stammt."
2. Op.cit.

are assumed to express the view of the opponent (pūrvapakṣa) for the sake of strengthening the argument, and may not necessarily be a statement of facts. Even if we admit Delbruck's standpoint to be correct, the question as to how such a precedence of one related by blood over the other coming from another clan had no recognition in the Brāhmaṇa period remains to be answered. Moreover, the significant epithets 'samānodaryā' and 'anyodaryā' seem to imply something more than mere 'blood-relationship', and its 'absence', for the simple reason, that, had this been the case, the order of precedence should have been the reverse. Is it not reasonable to think that one with whom one had the closest ties should be preferred against the other coming from outside the clan with whom kinship exists only through marriage ? It is therefore, more possible that 'samānodaryā' indicates 'one belonging to the same clan, and 'anyodaryā', 'one belonging to a different clan'. In other words, here also, 'jāmi' refers particularly to a member of the non-marriageable group' although it apparently seems to be identical with the 'unmarried sister.'

In the other Brāhmaṇas 'jāmi' (mostly in the neuter) appears in the sense of repetition and so also in the Śrauta Sūtras.

Thus on comparing the Brāhmaṇa passages we arrive at the conclusion, that 'jāmi' in the Brāhmaṇa texts has a wider sense than that of a 'sister'. It in all probability is a common designation for the members of a non-marrigeable group, and as such non-approachable by those who abided by the exogamous system.

Concluding this chapter it may be pointed out that in the Brāhmaṇas the eagerness expressed to be established among the 'jana's on the one hand and the slur cast upon the 'jāmi' on the other, provides further evidence for the existence of clan-exogamy in those days. In an exogamous system alone such a liking for the marriageable group and a tendency to avoid the non-marriageable one seems natural.

CHAPTER III.

'FAMILY RELATIONSHIP'

Closely related to the problem of clan-exogamy, is that of family-relationship, for which again, no direct evidence is available in the Brāhmaṇas. It is only through a study of some words expressing kinship directly, that we are able to form an idea of the familiar life of those days. Such words in these texts have already been studied by Delbruck,[1] Schroeder,[2] the authors of the Vedic Index, and others. It is, however, easily perceptible that some of them, even after their analysis by the scholars are of doubtful meaning and as such a further investigation is necessary, with a view to understanding their right implications.

Among these, both in the Brāhmaṇas and the Sūtras, Ānujāvara, Agre-didhiṣu, Didhiṣūpati, Parivitta, Parividāna, Bhrātṛvya and Sajāta are undoubtedly of much social significance. In this chapter, therefore, we are primarily concerned with them, and the following pages present a review of most of the passages in the Brāhmaṇas in which they occur. Their appearence in the different Saṃhitas has been noted, and suggestions have been made with regard to their gradual change in meaning in later texts.

(A)

'Agre-didhiṣu, Didhiṣūpati Parivitta and Parivividāna'.

The laws of marriage even as early as the period of the Saṃhitās, can only be inferred from the words found in such texts expressing marriage-relationship. Among them, 'Agre-didhiṣu', 'Didhiṣū-pati', 'Parivitta' and 'Parivividāna' are of considerable importance. It is true that these are related more with the violation of marriage rules, for which expiation is later prescribed, but the very fact that they reappear

---

1. D.I.V.
2. Pre. Ant.

in the Brāhmaṇas and even in the Sūtras, indicates that such prohibited forms of kinship, with which the people were too familiar, played an important part in regulating marriage in those days. It is therefore reasonable to find out what is precisely meant by these words, for which a consideration both of the Mantra and the Brāhmaṇa portions in which they occur is indispensable.

It is necessary to understand what is meant by 'didhiṣu' in order to find out the significance of 'agre-didhiṣu' and 'didhiṣū-pati'. Fortunately 'didhiṣu' occurs in the Ṛgveda more than once, though the compounds 'agre-didhiṣu' and 'didhiṣū-pati' are not found. Its first occurence is in R.V. VI.55.5., where Pūṣan is spoken of as the 'didhiṣu' of his mother, the lover (jāra) of his sister, the brother of Indra and our friend: "*Mātur didhiṣum abravaṃ svasur jāraḥ śṛṇotu naḥ; bhrātendrasya sakhā naḥ.*" Sāyaṇa here interprets it as husband (patiṃ). The authors of the Vedic Index, Grassman, Boehtlingk and Roth, and Griffith, however, translate it as 'wooer' or 'suitor'.[1] There is a slight difference in these two interpretations as the 'wooer' or 'suitor' may not essentially be the 'husband.' That the rendering of the modern scholars is more appropriate here, is clear from the fact that 'jāra', which can be understood only in the sense of a 'lover'[2] appears in the same context and is also to be connected with Pūṣan. That 'didhiṣu and 'jāra' are almost identical in sense here is easily inferrable.

The word appears next in X1.8.3., in the context of a woman who has lost her husband, and lies beside his dead body intending to follow him even in death. The Ṛk states: 'Arise O woman, to the world of life, thou liest beside this dead one (husband); Come! this thy position of wife to the husband, the 'didhiṣu', who holds thy hand, is reached; '*udīrṣva nāryabhi jīva-lokaṃ gatāsum etam upa śeṣa ehi; hasta-grābhasya didhiṣos tavedaṃ patyur janitvam abhi saṃ babhūtta*'. This Ṛk has been studied with great care by Vedic scholars, and as such may be analysed here in detail. At the outset, it may be mentioned that it appears also

---

[1] cf. V.I. Vol. 1. 359; W. Z. R. and P. W.—Bewerber, Freier.
[2] cf. V.I. Vol. I, 286—'jāra' has no sinister sense.

(with slight variation as Sāyaṇa interprets it, but agrees verbatim according to Whitney and the authors of V.I.) in A.V.XVIII.3.2. Introducing R.V.X.18.8. he (Sāyaṇa) says that the brother of the husband etc. should raise the wife of the dead (husband) from (where she lies near) her (dead) husband with this (Rk. beginning with) '*Udīrṣva*' etc; ("Devarādikaḥ pretapatnīm udīrṣva nārīty anayā bhartṛ-sakāśād utthāpayet"). He also refers to Āśvalayāna Gr. Sūtra IV.2.18.[1] '(Sūtritaṃ ca' etc.). On the other hand, with reference to A.V. reference he says more specifically: "one should raise her (the wife) who (wishes) to meet her dead (husband) in death, if she desires to live again in this world after being made to lie down beside (her dead husband), saying this second Ṛk, beginning with '*udīrsva*' etc."[2] Comenting on R.V.10.18.8. he explains '*didhiṣos*' as the 'layer of the seed, : 'garbhasya nidhātuḥ' and understands the second part of the Ṛk thus: 'Come, as thou hast decided to die along with him, keeping in mind thy position of wifehood, being related with this thy husband, who laid his seed in you and held your hand (in marriage)'[3]: Interpreting '*dadhiṣos*' in A.V.XVIII.3.2. he says it refers to the 'supporter': dhārayituḥ' and renders the verse as: 'thou hast obtained birth of thy husband, in the form of the progeny etc., who was the supporter and the holder of (thy) hand;[4] It is apparent from these two meanings that he gives to 'didhiṣu' that he connects the word with the dead husband ('preta'), and while in the Ṛgvedic passage he suggests the futility of the wife laying beside her husband who is dead, in spite of her having lost the position of a wife, due to which alone she had decided to meet her lover even in death, in the A.V. passage, he points out the rebirth of the husband

---

1. V.I.'s ref. to Āś. Śr. Sūtra IV.218. is a misprint.
2. "upa-ni.padymānā sā yadi iha loke punar jīvitum icchet tadā udīrṣva ityanayā dvitīyayarcā pretena saha saṃviṣṭāṃ tām abhimantrya utthāpayet".
3. "yasmāt tvaṃ hasta-grābhasya pāṇigrahaṃ kurvato didhiṣor garbhasya nidhātuḥ tavāsya patyuḥ sambandhād āgataṃ idam janitvaṃ jāyātvam abhilakṣya saṃ-babhūtha saṃbhūtāsi anumaraṇa-niścayām akārṣīḥ tasmād āgaccha".
4. "hastaṃ gṛhṇātīti hastagrābhaḥ pāṇi-grahaṇa-kartā tasya, dadhiṣoḥ dhārayituḥ tava patyuḥ idaṃ janitvaṃ apatyādi-rūpeṇa janmatvaṃ abhi saṃbabhūtha abhi-sam-prāptāsi".

in the offspring. The second suggestion of Sāyaṇa is undoubtedly based on a mis-conception of 'janitvaṃ' being identical with 'janmatvaṃ'. The corresponding form in Avestan is 'jani', meaning 'wife' and not 'zani', which we would naturally expect if the root in 'janitva' was 'jan', which the explanation of Sāyaṇa obviously presupposes.

Whitney, in his translation of the Atharvaveda, however, takes 'didhiṣos' to be the correct reading as is found in the Paippalāda recension, and also in some manuscripts of the vulgate. Thus, A.V.XVIII.3.2. which is the same as Rv.x.18.8 should be translated according to him as: 'Go up, O woman, to the world of the living; thou liest by this one who is deceased; come to him who grasps thy hand, thy second spouse (didhiṣu) thou hast now entered into the relation of wife to husband'. He further argues that abhisaṃ-bhū can only be understood in the above sense, and 'didhiṣu' must be interpreted according to its 'later accepted meaning'.[1] Again, he disagrees with the views expressed by the Kauśika-Sūtrakāra, (80-45), by Sāyaṇa and by the redactor of the Vaitāna-Sūtras (38.3) with reference to the specification of the context in which this Ṛk is used. According to him: 'the woman cannot be left free and independent, she can only be relieved of her former wife-hood by taking up a new one (even if this be as is probable enough nominal only); he who grasps her hand to lead her down from the pile, becomes at least for once her husband'.[2] (confirmed by Āś. Gṛ.S. IV.2.18).

Oldenberg, too, in his 'Die Religion des Veda' seems to hold a similar opinion. He translates it as: 'Arise up O wife to the world of the living, his life-breath is gone, by whom thou liest. To this groom here who holds your hand who wooes thee, thou hast reached'[3] and thinks the reference is to 'the brother-in-law taking over the position of the bride-groom' (die Stelle des Gatten einnehmender Schwager) confirmed by Āś.G.S.IV.2.18. He also raises the question whether in this context we should understand 'didhiṣu' in the special sense given to it by the lexicographers: "Ist bei dem im Text verwandten Wort 'didhiṣu' an den speciellen Sinn den die Lexicographen ihm beilegen (Gatte einer zum zweiten Mal verheiratheten Frau) zu denken".[1] He, however, does not attach much importance to Hillebrandt's analysis of this verse in Z.D.M.G. 40.708.

---

[1] i.e. the meaning given to it by the later lexicographers. A.K.2.6.1.23. H. 525.

[2] Trans. of the Atharvaveda pp.848-849.

[3] "Erhebe dich, O Weib, zur Welt der Lebender. Hingegangen ist sein Lebenshauch—bei dem du liegst. Zu dieser Ehe hier mit dem Gatten, der deine Hand ergreift der um dich freit, bist du gelangt."

Keith and Macdonell too, are of the opinion that in this context, the word (didhiṣu) is used for the 'brother-in-law', and find a parallel here to the Hebraic levirate, which is also confirmed by R.V.X.40.2- (*kuha svid doṣā kuha vastor aśvinā kuhābhipitvaṃ karataḥ kuhośatuḥ*; *ko vāṃ śayutrā vidhaveva devaraṃ maryaṃ na yoṣā kṛṇute sadhastha ā*). They agree with Oldenberg in maintaining that the supposed connection of this verse with the Puruṣamedha, suggested by Hillebrandt and accepted by Lanman, cannot be considered to be plausible.[2]

Grassman, Boehtlingk and Roth, however, agree with Sāyaṇa's interpretation and do not think that the term 'didhiṣu' here refers to the 'second husband'.[3]

It is clear here that the crucial word is 'didhiṣu'. The whole controversy lies as to whether it has been used for the dead husband or the brother-in-law. It cannot be denied that the ṛk quoted above has been the basis of Manu's well known statement regarding the 'didhiṣū-pati', though, however, the funeral context of the mantra does not necessarily refer to the second marriage of the widow, as even 'Āśvalāyana' who quotes this verse[4] applies it to merely lifting up of the woman whose husband is dead, from the pile by the representative of the husband, the pupil of the husband or the old servant. It seems, however, natural to imagine that the representative of the husband refers to himself as 'didhiṣu', and 'abhi-saṃbabhūtha' makes better sense if it is construed as referring to a recent happening. There seems to be little, justification, however, for maintaining that 'didhiṣu' is used here in the

---

1. Die Religion des Veda-573.
2. V.I. Vol. I.p. 359.
3. Z.D.M.G. 40. 708.
4. loc. cit.

later sense of 'the husband of a twice married woman' as understood by lexicographers, since in the Ṛgveda no other verse occurs, which, conforms to this. Even in X.40.2. the term 'devara' appears and not 'didhiṣu'. It is therefore, safer to render 'didhiṣu', even in this context, as the 'lover' or 'suitor'.[1]

Prior to our understanding of 'agre-didhiṣu' and 'didhiṣū-pati' occuring only in the Brāhmaṇa portions of the Black Yajurveda and the Brāhmaṇas (with the exception of 'edidhiṣuḥpati' in the Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā which is probably the corrupt form of agre-didhiṣuḥ) the single instance of 'parivitta' found in the Atharvaveda should be considered, as both 'parivitta' and 'parivividāna' appear in the same context, as 'agre-didhiṣuḥ' and 'didhiṣū-patiḥ' in the later texts.

Thus in A.V.VI.112.3., in the context of the 'Expiation for the precedence of the younger brother over the older brother in marriage, 'parivitta' is used. It states: "The fetters with which the 'parivitta' is bound, with which, he has been encumbered and shackled limb by limb, may they be loosened since they are fit for loosening; O Pūṣan wipe off the sin on the slayer of the embryo": *'yebhiḥ pāśaiḥ parivitto vibaddho 'nge anga arpitaḥ utsitaś ca; vi te mucyantām vimuco ḥi santi bhruṇaghni pūṣan duritāni mṛkṣva'*. Sāyaṇa explains 'parivitta' here as 'the man (the younger brother) who marries first (in the family) whilst the eldest brother remains unmarried: "parivittaḥ jyeṣthe akrtadāra-parigrahe pūrvaṃ gṛhītadāraḥ". Ludwig,[2] in his translation agrees with Sāyaṇa, but proposes to read 'parivettā' instead of 'parivitta'. Delbruck, Keith and Macdonell, Boehtlingk and Roth, Bloomfield, Zimmer and Whitney, however, understand it in the sense of 'the elder brother who remains unmarried, while the younger brother gets married'.[3] It is difficult to come to a decision as to which interpretation is correct as both the unmarried elder brother and the married younger brother were considered to be equally sinful. This variance, however, does not make any material difference as far as the meaning of the verse goes, though it is rather peculiar, that Sāyaṇa goes against the traditional interpretation. On the other hand, as will be seen later Mahīdhara does not deviate from the tradition. It is, however, obvious that 'parivitta', which also appears in the Vājasaneyī, refers merely to one of sinful conduct in the A.V. and indicates, as has been rightly pointed out by Zimmer and others, that the order of marriage was based on seniority in the days of the Saṃhitās.

---

[1] cf. Delbruck D.I.V. p. 583.

[2] Ludwig also contradicts Sāyaṇa by saying 'oder (so der text) der aeltere der den juengeren frueher hat heirathen laszen'.—'Der Ṛgveda'.

[3] Del. 'einer dem ein anderer im Heirathen zuvor gekommen ist; V.I.p. 496; B. & R : ein aelterer Bruder, der unbeweibe ist, waehrend der jungere geheiraṭḥet hat. Am. J. O. Ph. Vol. 17. 430 Z. der unverheirathete aeltere Bruder; 'Trans. of the A.V. 'the over-slaughing one.'

In the Vāsjasaneyī, we find 'parivitta', 'parivividāna' and 'edidhisuḥpati' in the context of 'the victims to be sacrificed in the Puruṣamedha'. It may be pointed out here that it is more than probable that the list of victims found in V. S. XXX. 9, is a later addition to the main bulk of the Saṃhitā, as it is more complete than that in the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa. Thus 'parivitta' and 'parivividāna' occuring here should more appriopriately be studied along with the Taittirīya passage in the context of the main Brāhmaṇas.

Passing on, therefore, to the Brāhmaṇa portions of the Kāṭhaka and Maitrāyaṇi, we find all these expressions appearing in the list of sinful beings, probably, in the context of the legend of 'Trita and the other Āptyas wiping off the guilt of the gods, deposited in themselves'.[1] Thus in M. S. IV 1. 9, it is mentioned that "they (gods) wiped it (sin) off over 'the "Suryābhyudita' (i. e. one who sleeps while the sun has risen), he in turn (wipes it off) over one upon whom (while sleeping) the sun has set, and (thence the sin is passed on successively) from him to one with brown teeth, to one with bad nails, to the 'agre-dadhus'. to the 'parivitta', to the 'parivividāna', to the killer of human beings and finally, to the slayer of the embryo (or the Brahman)".[2] In the

[1] Bloomfield: A.J.P. 17, 430 etc. Bloomfield is justified in thinking A.V. VI. 112.3 to be another version of the legend of Trita.

[2] *'suryābhyudite te' mṛjanta (yaṃ suptam sūryo 'bhyudeti) suryābhyuditaḥ suryabhinimrukte, suryābhinimruktaḥ śyāvadati, śyāvadan kunakhini, kunakhy agredadhuṣi, agredadhuh parivitte, parivittah parivividāne, parivividano vīrahaṇi, vīrahā bhrūṇahani, bhrūṇahanam eno nāty eti.*

Kāṭhaka the list again appears in XXXI. 7. with the addition of didhiṣūpati' and the form 'agre-dādhiṣuh' instead of 'agre-daduḥ'. In the Kapiṣṭhala recension it is shortened beginning with 'Kunakhī' and the reading is slightly different in the end: '*vīrahā brahmajye,* (one who molests or oppresses Brahmans) *brahmajyo bhrūṇahani, bhrūṇahanam eno nāty eti.*,[1] It must also be noted that the order in the transference of guilt is slightly different in the Kāṭhaka and Kapiṣṭhala, than that found in the Maitrāyanī. In the latter 'agre-dadhuḥ' precedes 'parivitta' and parivividāna' whereas in the former two versions 'agre-didhiṣuḥ' and 'didhiṣū-patih' come after 'parivitta' and 'parivividāna'.

This difference in order, cannot, however, be considered to be of much significance, as the passage reappears in the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa (III. 2. 8. 12)[2] and the classification is identical with that in the Maitrāyaṇī. It seems reasonable to infer from these passages, that 'agre-didhiṣu', 'didhiṣū-pati', 'parivitta' and 'parivividāna', were all considered to be equally sinful in those days, and that there is certainly some common element between 'agre-didhisu' and 'didhiṣū-pati' on the one hand, and 'parivitta' and 'parivividāna' on the other.

Prior to our discusssion on the interpretation of these words, we may reasonably review the passages in the Vājasaneyi and the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, which are relevant to our investigation, and state the point of view of the commentators.

In V. S. XXX.9. 'parivitta', 'parivividāna' and 'edidhisuḥpati', mentioned among the Puruṣamedha victims, are stated to be sacrificed for the deities presiding over 'ārti' (injury), 'nirṛti' (destruction) and 'arāddhi' (ill-success), while 'jāra' (lover) and 'upapati' (co-husband) appearing before these are dedicated to deities connected with 'sandhi', (unification) and 'geha' (household) respectively.[3] The Tai. B., however, places 'nirṛti' before 'parivitta', and 'ārti' before

---

[1] cf. Delbruck's emended version in D. I. V. 580. Here, on the other hand, yet another form 'agre-dadhiṣu' appears.

[2] Here the form 'agre-didhiṣu' is found and 'didhiṣūpati' seems to be omitted.

[3] '*sandhaye jāram gehāyopapatim, ārtyai parivittaṃ; nirṛtyai parivividānaṃ arāddhyai edidhisuḥ-patiṃ*';

'parivividāna' and has 'didhiṣū-pati' in place of 'edidhisuḥ-pati'.[1]

Commentators are at variance in interpreting this passage. Thus Sāyaṇa understands : (1) 'parivitta' as the youngest brother marrying before the eldest has married', (2) 'parivividāna' as 'one having the intention to marry first in other words, though the youngest (among brothers) yet eager for it, and (3) 'didhiṣūpati', as the husband of a twice-married woman : (parivittaṃ-jyeṣṭha-pūrvamevoḍhabhāryaṃ kaniṣṭhaṃ, parivividānaṃ-prathamato vivāhaśīlaṃ, kaniṣṭhaḥ sann-tadāgrahayuktam ityarthaḥ, 'didhiṣūpatim'-dvir vivāhaṃ kṛtavatī strī didhiṣūs tasyāḥ patiṃ). Mahīdhara and Bhaṭṭa-bhāskara Miśra on the other hand explain them differently. According to Mahīdhara (a) 'Parivitta' refers to the unmarried elder brother while the younger brother, is already married. (b) 'Parivividāna' to the married youngest brother, while the eldest is unmarried and (c) 'Edidhisuḥ-pati' to the husband of one (younger daughter) married before the eldest daughter (in the family) is married. (ūḍhe kaniṣṭhe anūḍhaṃ; anuḍhe jyeṣṭhe ūḍhavantaṃ; jyeṣṭhāyāṃ putryām uḍhā edidhisuḥ tat-patiṃ). Bhaṭṭabhāskara holds a similar view regarding 'parivitta' and 'parivividāna',[2] and interprets 'didhiṣū-pati' as the husband of the younger sister while her elder sister is unmarried; "jyāyasyāmānūḍhāyāṃ kanīyasī pūrvam uhyate sā didhiṣuḥ tasyāh patiṃ."

Sāyaṇa, as we see here, construes 'parivividāna' differently and gives to 'parivitta' the same sense as in A. V. VI. 112. 3; with regard to 'didhiṣūpati' he quotes a later tradition. Mahīdhara and Bhaṭṭabhāskara explaining 'edidhiṣuḥpati' and 'didhiṣūpati' respectively, conform to a totally different tradition.[3] It is strange that in elucidating 'parivitta' in Taitt. Br. III. 2. 8. 11 (referred to above) he agrees with Sāyaṇa, and considers the sense of the 'unmarried elder brother' (which he proposes in this context) as being accepted by some.[4] It

---

1. III.4.4.1.
2. "yasmāt pūrvaṃ kanīyān ūḍhabhāryaḥ; jyeṣṭhapūrvamev-oḍhabhāryaṃ".
3. 'parivittaḥ jyeṣṭhāt pūrvam ūḍhavān, asyaiva jyeṣṭha ityeke.
4. The view suggested here is usually linked with the 'agredidhiṣu' in the later Dharmasutras (cf. V. I. I. 360).

is, perhaps, not so much indicative of his inconsistency in interpretation as of the prevalence of two equally strong traditions. It can not, however, be decided which of these traditions was known to the Brāhmaṇakāras merely on the basis of these renderings as Sāyaṇa, Mahīdhara and Bhaṭṭabhaskara have only repeated the well-known views expressed on these in the Dharma and Gṛhya Sūtras, which may not necessarily be identical with those held by the Brāhmaṇa compilers. Still it cannot be denied that almost similar notions must have prevailed even in those days, in connection with these significant words. It is worthwhile noting in this passage that while 'jāra' and 'upa-pati' are dedicated in sacrifice to the deities representing conciliation and settlement, parivitta and parivividāna and didhiṣūpati are given away to those representing 'injury', 'destruction' and 'ill-success', which reasonably leads us to the conclusion that the conduct of the latter was considered to be much more sinful than that of the former. Moreover, in the Brāhmaṇas we hardly come across any deprecation against the secret lover and the co-husband. Again the absence of the 'jāra' and the 'upa-pati' in the lists of sinful beings quoted above, shows that in the relationship expressed by them, no departure from the normal practice was involved, which precisely was the case with that indicated by others mentioned in that context. Consequently we have to understand 'parivitta' as referring to the elder brother, who is superseded in marriage by his younger brother, who would then naturally be the 'parivividāna'. It need hardly be mentioned that the right of priority belonged to the elder brother not only in marriage but also in other matters, as is clearly indicated by the use of 'ānujāvara' etc.[1] and the laying down of the injunctions specially for the 'jyeṣṭha' and the 'jyaiṣṭhineya' in most of the Brāhmaṇas, and a supercession of such rights could not be considered normal.

With regard to 'agre-didhiṣu' and 'didhiṣūpati', the situation is not so simple, and hence the emergence of diverse traditions in the context of their interpretation. Now it is obvious, 'didhiṣu' provides the common link between them, which, as we have already indicated means only the 'wooer' or 'suitor' in the Ṛgveda and the Atharvaveda. It is not, however, clear whether in these early texts it denotes simply the male wooer or applies also to the female having the choice of the spouse (thus being comparable to a suitor), since the form 'didhiṣū' with the long 'ū' (the regular feminine form according to the uṇādi sūtras) is not found in them. There is, nevertheless, one instance in the Ṛgveda, where the feminine plural 'didhiṣvo' appears (*aryo didhiṣvo vibhṛtrā*), which may reasonably be construed as referring to the women having the right to court their own husbands.[1] Here, it is not certain whether the basic form is 'didhīṣu', or didhiṣū though Sāyaṇa accepts the latter in accordance with the later usage. It may be argued fairly reasonably that as 'didhiṣū' is not met with anywhere else in the Ṛgveda, 'didhiṣu' has to be accepted as being both masculine as well as feminine. Eventually 'agre-didhiṣuḥ' may be treated either as a masculine form or as a feminine form. In other words, it may be considered as an adjectival noun with two terminations.

---

[1] See next Chap.

If we accept therefore, 'agre-didhiṣu' as describing the female, it has to be understood as 'the woman wooed before', implying that she has had the freedom of courting someone other than the man to whom she is wedded, before entering into marriage, and, as such is considered to be sinful. That the 'fore-courting'[2] woman, was looked upon with special disfavour is clear from some passages in the Brāhmaṇas. On the other hand, if we take the word as depicting the male, the obvious inference would be, that 'a man who possesses a wife who had a former suitor' is meant. In that case, however, 'agre-didhiṣuḥ' would be identical with 'didhiṣūpati' which can only mean 'the husband of such a woman who has been wooed before.' It would, therefore, be more advisable to interpret 'agre-didhiṣu' in the former sense. It is interesting to note that in one of the much later Dharmasūtras the form 'agre-didhiṣūpatih[3] does appear, which leads us to the presumption that 'didhiṣūpatih' is perhaps an abbreviated form for 'agredidhiṣūpatiḥ.'[1]

---

[1] I.71.3.—Here 'aryo' is significant, meaning 'belonging to the 'ari' and probably confirms our interpretation of 'ari', but as the meaning of the verse is not clear, it is safer not to make any deductions.

[2] cf. Delbruck—D. I. V. 583-86—'Vorfreierin'.

[3] Vas. XX. 7—cf. Delbruck Op. cit.

The views of the commentators concerning the marriage of the younger and the elder sisters, being implied in these two words, does bring out the difference between the two, but there is no evidence in the Brāhmaṇas to prove that one was not permitted to marry the younger sister when her elder sister was unmarried, or even to marry such an unmarried elder sister.

The transference again, of the sin is quite understandable, as it passes from the wife to the husband, while in the case of the 'parivitta' and the 'parivividāna' it is carried over to the younger brother from the elder brother.

In the Śrauta Sūtra of Apastamba we come across 'paryāhita', 'pariṣṭa', 'parivinna' in addition to 'parivitta', 'parivividāna', 'paryāhita', which are certainly concerned more with the ritual in particular, though based on the same principle of priority of the elder brother over the younger one. 'Parivinna' though interpreted by the commentator as referring to the gaining of heritage by the younger brother at the expense of his eldest brother, must be understood, as proved by Delbruck[2] to convey the same sense as 'Parivitta' in the Brāhmaṇas and hence the simultaneous occurence of 'parivitta' and 'parivinna' here, is, in all probability, an error on the part of the compiler : (yanma ātmano mindābhūt punar agniś caksur adād, ityetābhyām abhinimruktābhyu-dita-paryāhita-pariṣṭa-parivitta-parivinna-parivividāno vā juhuyāt : japed ityeke...IX. 12. 11).

Thus, in the Brāhmaṇas, while in 'agre-didhiṣu', and 'didhiṣū-pati', the impropriety in the woman having a suitor prior to her marriage, and the man contracting marriage with such a woman, is emphasised, in 'parivitta' and 'parividāna', the improper supercession by the younger brother of the right of priority in marriage associated with the elder brother is stressed.

---

[1] The distinction between 'agre-didhiṣu' and 'agre-didhiṣū' as noted by Delbruck, can hardly be considered to be of much significance in the context of the Brāhmaṇas.

[2] D. I. V., 582.

B

'*Ānujāvara*'

Ānujāvara again presents an interesting study. The meaning of the word in the Brāhmaṇas is uncertain and as such an investigation of passages in which it occurs will not be unjustifiable. It will be apparent from the following analysis that its appearance is rather infrequent in the Brāhmaṇas, and consequently has not attracted much the attention of scholars. Nevertheless, it has to be borne in mind that the special use of the term in certain contexts evidences the fact that some importance was attached to it, in as much as it expressed a particular type of kinship in the earlier and the later phases of the Vedic period, It is with a view to find out this significant idea underlying the conception of ānujāvara' that this review seems all the more necessary.

At the outset, it must be stated that it is striking that it is not found in any of the Saṃhitas other than that of the Black Yajurveda, and here also only in its Brāhmaṇa portions. This does not inevitably lead us to conlcude that it was unknown in the early period of the Ṛgveda, since it may be suggested more reasonably that in these texts one is not expected to find such words which are peculiar to the ritual. The utmost that we can infer from the fact that it occurs only in the Brāhmaṇa portions and the Brāhmaṇas is that while it basically denotes a certain degree of family relationship, it also implies the lack of a status which was essential primarily for the performance of rituals.

Thus in the Kāṭhaka, Maitrāyaṇi and also the Taittirīya recensions in their Brāhmaṇa portions we find 'Ānujāvara' used in a few places under separate contexts. To begin with in the Kāṭhaka XI.4., in the context of the Iṣṭis with special reference to the offering of the Aindra-Bārhaspatya-caru, it is stated "the Bārhaspatya-caru (rice oblation for Bṛhaspati) of the Ānuṣūka rice should be offered by tha Ānujāvara. Bṛhaspati is indeed the Ānujāvara among the Devas, he should come forward; Bṛhaspati is his deity, it is after him that he (the Ānujāvara) performs; he (Bṛhaspati) leads him forward; Brahman (the priest) is indeed Bṛhaspati-Brahman is the father (originator) of the Brahman.[1] Again in XIII.7., in the same context describing the animals (victims) ordained for Varuṇa etc. (varuṇa-gṛhītādi-paśavaḥ) it is stated, 'the Ānujāvara should sacrifice the Kṛṣṇalalāma (victim with a black-spot), ordained for the Aśvins; the two Aśvins are indeed the two Ānujāvaras among the Devas, they went forward, the Asvins are the deities of him who is an Ānujāvara, in accordance with them he performs (the Iṣṭi), they carry him to the forefront; possessed of evil is he who is an Ānujāvara. Evil is like black (in that) it (the victim) is black, he (the Ānujāvara) destroys evil.[2] Further in XXVII.7.9. in the context of the Āgrāyaṇa rite, it is laid down that: The Devas and the Asuras performed equally in the sacrifice; whatever the Devas did, the Asuras (also) did; those Asuras rose higher and grew more prosperous, the Devas (on the other hand) fell lower and were considered to be sinful like the 'Ānujāvara-tara's. Those Devas saw the Āgrāyaṇa rite; they took it; through it they went forward. That they went forward, this is why the Agr. is so called.[3] Lastly in XXX.3. in the context of the holding of the cup for Indra and Vāyu etc. it is laid down that "the Ānujāvara should accept those (cups) which are before (agra) the Aśvins; the two Aśvins indeed are the two Ānujāvaras among the Devas. These two went forward; the two Aśvins are the deities of one, who is an Ānujāvara, in accordance with them he performs; these two lead him forward.[4] Here it is evident from the way in which the word 'Ānujāvara' occurs, that what is meant to be emphasized is his inferior position, which he should set aside with the aid of these performances in order to attain a position higher than the original one. It is needless to state, that the phrases 'agraṃ paryait' or 'agraṃ pariṇayati' can only be understood in the sense of achieving a higher rank. Moreover the fact of sin or evil being connected with the 'Ānujāvara' especially in 13.7. presupposes that the state of being an Ānujāvara was considered to be indicative of lowliness in the opinion of the ritualists of those days. Still the exact position of an Ànujāvara or as a matter of fact the very meaning of the word is not clear in these passages. Similar is the case with passages agreeing verbally with these, which are found in the Maitrāyaṇi recension (IV.6.4; II,5.4.6. etc.). There is however, an interesting piece of evidence in 11.4. above, for the rather peculiar position of Bṛhaspati among the Devas. As the passage stands, it seems that primarily the position of Bṛhaspati was considered to be inferior in the pantheon of Gods, but was subsequently raised with the passing of time. In the days of Brahmanical superiority, that we should come across the dual conception of Bṛhaspati as the Brahman priest as well as the Ānujāvara among the Devas, seems rather strange and the reasons which led to this discrepancy may call for further investigation, but that, strictly speaking, is not within the purview of our study here.

---

[1] *'Bārhaspatyaṃ caruṃ nirvaped ānuṣūkānāṃ vṛīhīṇām ānujāvaro; brhaspatir vai devānām ānujāvaras so 'graṃ paryaid; bṛhaspatir vā etasya devatā ya ānujāvaras tamev ānvārabhate, sa enam agram pariṇayati; bṛahma vai bṛhaspatir brahma brāhmaṇasya pitā.'*

[2] *"Āśvinaṃ kṛṣṇa-lalāmaṃ ālabhet ānujāvaro, aśvinau vai devānām ānujāvarau, tā agrāṃ paryaitāṃ aśvinā etāsya devatā ya ānujāvaras ta evānvārabhate, tā enaṃ agraṃ pariṇayataḥ, pāpmanaiṣa gṛhīto ya ānujāvaraḥ, kṛṣṇa iva yat pāpmā, yatkṛsṇaḥ, pāpmānam eva apahati".*

[3] *cf. "Devāśca vā asurāśca samāvad eva yajñe' kurvata; yad eva devā akurvata tad asurā akurvata; te 'surā bhūyāṃsas śreyāṃsa āsan, kanīyāṃsaḥ pāpīyāṃsa ānujāvaratarā iva devās; te devā etam āgrāyaṇam apaśyaṃs tam agṛhṇan; tenāgraṃ paryāyan yad agraṃ paryāyanstad āgrāyaṇāsy āgrāyaṇatvaṃ".*

[4] *"Āśvināgrān gṛhṇit, ānujāvaro; aśvinau vai devānām ānujāvarau, tā agram paryaitām aśvina etasya devatā ya āuujāvaras; tā evanvārabhate tāh enaṃ agra pariṇayataḥ."*

Coming to the Taittirīya Saṃhitā, we may examine the views of Sāyaṇa in this connection. In II. 3. 4. 2. 3. 4; 'ānujāvara' occurs in the context of the Iṣṭis for those who wish to attain Svarga etc. (svarga-kāmādīnāṃ iṣṭayah). It is stated: 'Indra indeed is the Ānujāvara among the Devas. He approached Prajāpati. Prajāpati made the Ānuṣūka oblations for Indra, and thus enabled him to attain eminence among the Devas. Similarly if a Rājanya is an Ānujāvara, he should offer the Ānuṣūka for Indra on eleven pots-herds. (or) if a Brahman is an Ānujāvara he should offer the Ānuśūka for Bṛhaspati.[1] Śāyaṇa begins by pointing out that these passages apply to him, 'who being unable to attain eminence among his equals, remains inferior to his brother among them (yaḥ samānānāṃ madhye śreṣṭhyam alabhamānaḥ tadīyānujād avaro nikṛṣto vartate)'. Further he explains Ānujāvara as; one who lives as an 'anujāvara' i. e. one who has a status lower than that even of the younger brother, implying thereby one extremely low (anu paścāj jāto bhrātānujaḥ tasmād apy avaro 'nujāvaraḥ, tadvad vartamāna ānujāvaro 'tyantanikṛṣṭa ityarthaḥ).

---

[1] "*Indro vai devānām ānujāvaraḥ syāt sa prajāpatim upādhāvat......yo rājanyaḥ ānujāvaraḥ syāt tasmā etam aindram ānuṣūkam ekādaśakapālaṃ nirvapet* sa evainaṃ agraṃ samānānāṃ pariṇayati......*yo brāhmaṇaḥ ānujāvaraḥ syāt tasmā etaṃ bārhaspatyam ānuṣūkam ekādaśakapālaṃ nirvapet.*"

Again, in VII. 2. 7. 2. which is more or less the same as Kāṭhaka XXX. 3.; Sāyaṇa indicates that the reason for the Aśvins being known as 'Ānujāvara's among the Devas lies probably in the fact that, though they were foremost among the Devas, still, on account of their presiding over or being physicians, they fell in rank (Devānāṃ madhye aśvināv ānujāvarau; svayaṃ devatvena pūjyau santāvapi bhiṣaktven avaratvam āpannau) and in agreement with this hypothesis interprets Ānujāvara as 'one who is disdained by others by becoming (behaving as) inferior as a younger brother, although he is considered by others to be worthy of respect, being the eldest in the family' (svayaṃ sarveṣām agrajatvena pūjyaḥ sannapi anujavad avaro bhūtvā yaḥ sarvais tiraskriyate so 'yam ānujāvaraḥ).

In VII. 2. 10. 2. where the phrase *'Indro vai devānāṃ ānujāvaraḥ; sa prajāpatim upā-dhāvat'* reappears, Sāyaṇa accounts for the falling in rank of Indra among the gods thus: 'Though Indra demanded respect as an elder brother by his excellence (among the Devas), yet, on some occasion, in the days gone by (became) inferior or degraded like a younger brother, and being shunned by all the Devas attended on Prajāpati in order to (be able to) know the means of averting this disgrace.[1]

It is obvious from these interpretations that according to Sāyaṇa 'Ānujāvara' is the same as 'anujāvara' with the short 'a' and should be split up as 'ānuja' or 'anuja' and 'avara' meaning that the two components of this word refer to the younger brother and 'inferior' respectively. The connecting link between them can be understood according to him in two ways; either as 'even inferior than the younger brother' or as inferior (in rank) as 'the younger brother'.

---

[1] "Indra uttamatven āgraja-bhrātṛvat pūjyo'pi san purā kadācit anujavad avaraḥ sarvair devais tiraskriyamāṇo bhūtvā tat-parihāropāyaṃ veditum prajāpatim upasevitavān."

This division, however, does not correspond with that in the Padapāṭha (to the Saṃhitās mentioned above), where we have 'anu' 'jāvara' and not 'anuja' 'avara'. It is also known, as pointed out by Viśvabandhu Sāstrī in his Vedic Kośa, that in the Pāda-pāṭha usually the short 'a' is not left out as in bhuta-aṃśu, upa-aṃśu. It is true, that the derivation in the Pāda-pāṭha may not invariably be the correct one,[1] but in cases where it yields a better sense it may readily be accepted and this is precisely the case here, as will be evident from the relevant passage in the Brāhmaṇas.

The Vṛddhi or the elongation of 'a' in 'Ānujāvara' has no significance, as the Mahābhāṣya on P. 5. 4. 36. 'Tad yuktāt karmaṇo 'ṇ' actually mentions it among those, which have the 'Aṇ' suffix causing the Vṛddhi, added to them without any specific reason as 'Sānnāyya' 'ānukṛṣṭa' etc.[2] The separation 'ānu-jāvara', therefore, is identical with 'anu-jāvara'. Thus, from the etymological point of view the word may be explained as formed with the root 'jan' to which the prefix 'anu' in the sense of 'after' and the taddhita suffix 'varac' in sense of possession,[3] (matvarthīya) are added. Consequently, 'Ānujāvara, is just another form of the word 'anuja' literally meaning 'born after', i. e. 'younger brother'. It can hardiy be denied, however, that it meant something more than 'anuja' due to its special use in the Brāhmaṇas.

It occurs only in the Tāṇḍya and the Taittirīya. Even in the latter it is seen only once in the context of a legend concerning the gaining of sovereignty of Indra among the Devas (S. Indrasya devādhipatyaṃ). Thus in II. 2. 10. 1 we have: 'Prajāpatir indram asṛjat ānujāvaraṃ devanaṃ' ('Prajāpati' created Indra the Ānujāvara among Devas). Here also both Sāyaṇa and Bhaṭṭabhāskara Miśra explaining the term, divide it into its two components as 'anuja' and 'avara'. Sāyaṇa as elsewhere, comments:—'Ānujāvara is like a younger brother

---

1. 'as is the case with 'aripra'—see Chap. I.
2. 'Sānnāyy-ānu-jāvarā-nukṛṣṭ-ānuṣŭka-cātuṣprāsya - rākṣo-ghna-varīvas-kṛt-āgrāyan-āgrahāyaṇa-santapanāni ityetāni chhandasi bhâṣāyaṃ ca nipātyante'—cf. Boehtlingk and Roth—'wo eine form 'Anuyājavara' (sie) mit bedeutungsloser verlaengerung des Anlauts aufgefuehrt wird.—P. W. 645.
3. cf. R. V. '*suprajävant, purvajāvan-vijāvan* etc.'

who being born after (the elder ?) is considered to be inferior (yathā bhrātṛṇāṃ madhye anujo paścājjātah avaraḥ nikṛṣṭas tad vad ayam ity ānujāvaraḥ). Bhaṭṭabhāskara, however, views it slightly differently as referring to one who acts in an inferior manner as a younger brother (anujavad avaraṃ). In other words according to him, Ānujāvara resembles a younger brother in so far as his actions are of an equally inferior nature. It seems possible, from this interpretation that 'Ānujāvara' may have been used to denote a special type of 'Anuja' with whom some form of misconduct was usually associated, which led to his inferiority in rank. It is, however, too flimsy an evidence on which any such deductions can be based.

The references in the Tāṇḍya are much more interesting. The first instance is II.3.3; where in the context of the Kūlāyinī Viṣṭuti of the Trivṛta stoma with special reference to the authorized 'sacrificer' (Adhikārī), it is stated that this (viṣṭuti) should be changed (by the chanters) for (the yajamāna who is) an Ānujāvara, (for by this) he (sacrificer) goes ahead of those children, who have (already) gone forward. (etam evānujāvarāya kuryādetāsām evāgraṃ paryatīnāṃ prājanām agraṃ paryyeti). It is apparent that the passage is rather curiously worded. Sāyaṇa interprets this as referring to an 'Ānujāvara' who (as before) is one even inferior to the younger brother (anujaḥ kanīyān sa hi nikṛṣṭaḥ tasmādapyavaro, nikṛṣṭa ānujāvaraḥ), and reaches by this chanting, that high position, which is attained by those who are at the highest among the people by reason of merit or age.[1] Caland on the other hand understands by Ānujāvara 'one born long after hts brothers', and translates "who by this (chanting) comes at the head of those (other) children, who by birth are the first." It is not clear, what Caland actually implies by 'one born long after his brothers'. He may be hinting at a 'posthumous on' which is appropriate in this context and may aptly be considered to be the correct sense of Ānujāvara at least in this passage.

In II.10.2, we come across another interesting reference in the context of the Ubhayasaptaika-madhyā-viṣṭuti, again with reference to the authorised sacrificer. It reads: "the Ānujāvara should chant it (viṣṭuti); he who is an Ānujāvara is indeed bereft of 'loka',[1] as seven verses come first, seven last and three in the middle and; 'puruṣa' is trisyllabic, thus he provides a 'loka' for himself in the middle and thrives in that 'loka'[2] Here also the meaning of 'Ānujāvara' is uncertain. Caland translates Ānujāvara as above and 'loko' as 'room'. Sāyaṇa on the other hand, giving to 'Ānujāvara' the same sense (as in the above-quoted passages), understands 'aloko va eṣa' as indicating the non-acceptance or an Ānujāvara' by the people at large, but fails to state the cause of such an attitude being held for the Ānujāvara in particular. The implication is obvious that the passage refers to his low status and achieving a slightly higher position, but what precisely is meant by the 'middle status'[3] is not easily deducible. It may however be suggested, that the Brāhmaṇakāra probably intends to point out that the Ānujāvara who was usually considered to have no status, could raise himself higher, only to a certain extent, as a place among the chosen few in society, was completely denied to him.

---

[1] 'yāḥ prajāh agraṃ vayoguṇādibhiḥ śreşţhapadaṃ pariyanti parito gacchanti etāsāmeva śraişţhyam parigacchantīnām prajānāṃ madhye sa yajamāna agraṃ śreşţham padaṃ paryyeti'.

In other words, the position of an 'Ānujāvara' was similar to that of the younger brother, who, in the family could never achieve the status that was rightfully claimed by the eldest son. Here too, it cannot be denied that the rendering 'posthumous son' seems to be fairly in agreement with the context, though not inevitable.

Lastly in XVI.14.2. in the context of the Sadyaḥ-kra-Ekāha, yet another injunction for the authorised sacrificer is laid down. According to it: "the Āṅgirasas reached the Ādityas: through this (Sadyaḥ-kra-Ekāha); one who is like an Ānujāvara, inferior (in status) should perform this (thereby) he attains the 'prahā' of those before him. The word 'prahā' seems to be indicative of something lost by the 'Ānujāvara, and hence Caland translates it an 'advantage' by which

[1] i. e. 'has no abode'.

[2] 'Ānujāvaras stuvītāloko vā eṣa yadānujāvaro; yat saptaprathamā saptottamās tisro madhye, tryakṣaraḥ puruṣaḥ; lokamevāsmai tan madhyataḥ karoti tasmin loke pratitiṣṭhati.'

[3] 'Loka' here is possībly identical with 'sthāna' in the sense of 'position' or status'.

probably he means 'the advantage of a better status'. Sāyaṇa, however, expresses the opinion that 'prahā' is the same as 'prahīṇa' meaning 'deterioration' which though etymologically correct does not fit in with the context. The sense of 'a posthumous son' is clearly acceptable here, as 'purveṣāṃ' here can only refer to those who preced him in age. It may however, be argued that the sense of a son born long after the birth of his elder brothers in a family, could be applicable to 'Ānujāvara' in this context, but that is tantamount to saying that the Ānujāvara is the same as Anujāvara which is the same as Anuja and as such does not help us in interpreting the passage.

To conclude, mention must be made of Keith's interpretation of Ānujāvara in his translation of the Taittirīya Saṃhitā and also the renderings proposed by Boehtlingk and Roth.

Keith attaches to it the signification "one of lower rank" where it occurs, and probably implies that it had nothing to do with family relationship in the days of the Brāhmaṇas.

Boehtlingk and Roth interpret it as one 'born later' or 'born after', (spaetgeboren, nachgeboren), obviously meaning the 'posthumous' one.[1]

Thus, on the evidence of the passages quoted and explained above, kinship-signification has undoubtedly to be attached to Ānujāvara in the Brāhmaṇas. The two possible interpretations that may be given to Ānujāvara are (a) 'a younger brother having an inferior status in the family, and(b) 'a posthumous son'. The younger brother may also be conceived of as a son born late in the family, who could even be the progeny of a second wife, and as such could not lay claim to a high rank in soceity. A posthumous son could in no way be considered equal to his step-brothers in as much as his status in the family was concerned.

---

[1] cf. also Monier Williams. Sk. Dict.

(c)

'Bhrātṛvya'

That 'Bhrātṛvya' originally expressed a certain degree of family-relationship is accepted by all Vedic scholars, though with a certain amount of difference in its specification. Strangely enough, however, no where in the whole range of Vedic literature, have the ancient commentators on the Vedas taken it as expressive of kinship, in spite of clear contextual evidence in quite a number of places both in the Saṃhitās and the Brāhmaṇas. The only reason that one can possibly think of as to how these erudite interpreters should have failed to notice the fundamental conception of 'Bhrātṛvya' is that of the influence which was unavoidable of a firmly established tradition, in which either the original sense was so obvious as to need no mention, or it was completely lost. Whichever may have been the case, as 'bhrātṛvya' is known to be of primary importance in the sphere of rituals in the Brāhmaṇas, and also has not yet been so satisfactorily explained as to dissassociate from it, its natural vagueness, a further analysis is necessary.

Even as early as the period of the Ṛgveda, we come across 'bhrātṛvya' conveying probably the later accepted sense of the 'enemy' or 'rival'. In VIII. 21. 13 the negative form of 'bhrātṛvya' appears as referring to Indra : *abhrātṛvyo anā tvam anāpir indra januṣā sanādasi*; *yudhed āpitvam icchase*'-A.V. XX. 114. 1. Sāyaṇa understands it in the sense of 'enemy or rival' and interprets : 'O Indra thou art by birth, without enemy'.[1] It may, however, be reasonably argued that, *'anāpi'* (kinless)—āpi in the sense of relations or kinsmen is frequent in the Ṛgveda, appearing here, together with 'abhrātṛvya' indicates that some form of relationship is also expressed by the latter. Now, as 'āpi' refers to relatives who are usually friendly towards the related ones, 'bhrātṛvya' may aptly designate those who are inimical towards them. In other words, both

---

[1] 'He Indra tvaṃ januṣā janmanaivābhrātṛvyaḥ, vyan sapatne'; Pā. 4. 1. 145; 'iti vyan pratyayaḥ'.

'bhrātṛvya' and 'āpi' are words expressive of kinship, though directly opposed to each other. It is, however, difficult to be definite about the correct interpretation of 'bhrātṛvya' here, as this is the only instance in the Ṛgveda, in which it occurs.[1]

In the White Yajurveda, however, in the Vājasaneyī recension in I. 17. 18, '*bhrātṛvyasya vadhāya*' can only be explained as 'for the slaying of the rival': '*dhruvamasi pṛthivīm dṛṃha*; *brahmavani tvā, kṣatravani tvā sajātavany upadadhāmi bhrātṛvyasya vadhāya.*[2] Mahīdhara too, construes 'bhrātṛvya' in the same way as Sāyaṇa.[3] In this Saṃhitā also, it is not clear whether 'bhrātṛvya' could be understood in any sense other than that of the rival, as there is no other passage which mentions it.

In the Black Yajurveda, both in the Kāṭhaka and Maitrāyaṇī recensions, it is seen in several passages and seems to involve both the ideas of 'kinship' and 'rivalry'. Thus in Kāṭ. X. 7, we find the 'bhrātṛvyas' of the sacrificer divided into three sections; e. g. (a) those who have preceded him, (b) those who are like him, and (c) those who come after him. Thus : 'a sacrificer having many 'bhrātṛvyas' should offer to the 'Pravat' the 'Vibādhavat' and the 'Pratīkavat' forms of Agni. In offering to the Pravat he destroys the 'bhrātṛvya' gone before him, and in that to the Vibādhavat he afflicts terribly the one (bhrātṛvya) who is his equal, while by offering to the Pratīka he drives out the 'bhrātṛvya' who (comes) after him.[4] It cannot be denied, that the constant wish of the sacrificer to uproot completely the 'bhrātṛvya' brings the sense of the 'enemy' to our mind, but at the same time the priority, the equality and the posteriority of the 'bhrātṛvyas' in relation to the sacrificer, leads us to believe that there was some relationship between the performer and his 'bhrātṛvya' or 'bhratrvya's.

---

[1] cf. Weber—I. S. 17. 307 'dafuer ist das such im Rik selbst einmal (8. 21. 13) nach der 'Anukr. Sobharī Kāṇva'.

[2] 'Thou art firm, fortify the earth—I worship thee, protector of Brahman, of Kṣatra and of the Sajāta'.

[3] 'vyan sapatne (Pa. 4. 1. 145) ityādy udāttatvāt bhrātṛvya-śabdaḥ śatruvācī'.

[4] '*Etayā yajet bhrātṛvyavān ; yo bahubhrātṛvyas syād agnaye pravate...nirvaped agnaye vibādhavate...agnaye pratīkavate' sṭākapālaṃ, yad agnaye pravate, ya evainam pūrvo 'tikrānto bhrātṛvyas taṃ tena praṇudate ; yad vibādhavate, ye evainena sadrṅ taṃ tena vibādhate; yat pratīkavate, ya evāsya paścād bhrātṛvyas taṃ tena apanudate—M. S, II, 1. II.*

Again in the Taittirīya we find another parallel passage which refers to the status of the 'bhrātṛvya's. In II. 4. 14 in the context of the performance of the Iṣti known as Vijiti, it is brought out that by this performance, the offerer repels the 'bhrātṛvya' who is superior, surpasses him who is equal and he who is inferior does not reach him.[1] Keith translates 'bhrātṛvya', here, as 'foe', which fits in with the context, as the conception of a foe as superior, equal, or inferior, in strength is adequate enough. Sāyaṇa too, taking 'bhrātṛvya' in the sense of 'foe' thinks that the three adjectives describe the 'bhrātṛvyas' greater in strength, equal in strength or inferior in strength (prabalah, samānabalaḥ hīnabalaḥ). Despite this, it is not impossible to imagine that the passage refers to the hostile kinsmen of the performer, among whom there are superiors, equals, or inferiors, in relation to him, according to age or status.

In the Atharvan, we are certainly in a better position to understand the precise connotation of 'bhrātṛvya'. In V. 22. 12, the 'bhrātṛvya' undoubtedly signifies relationship, other than that between brother and sister. It is clear that the diseases are spoken of here in terms of kinship. Thus 'Takman' (fever) with 'balāsa' (consumption) is addressed as the brother, 'kāsikā' (cough) as the sister and the 'pāman' (scab) as the 'bhrātṛvya' (*Takman bhrātrā balāsena svasrā kāsikayā, saha pāmnā bhrātṛvyeṇa saha gacchāmum araṇaṃ janaṃ*). Sāyaṇa does not comment on this verse. Delbruck expresses the opinion that 'bhrātṛvya' here must describe some type of relationship with reference to the 'brother' ('Bhrātṛvya' wo es also irgend einen zu dem Bruder in Beziehung stehenden Verwandtschaftsgrad bezeichnen muss).[2] Weber is definite that it refers to 'brother's son' (eig. Brudderssohn (S.A.V.V. 22. 12.). The authors of the Vedic Index, on the other hand take it in the sense of cousin.[3] Whitney too, construes it as cousin, though in translating II. 18. 1 he annotates : 'Adversary is literally 'nephew' or 'brother's son'.

---

[1] *'Pra śreyāṃsaṃ bhrātṛvyaṃ nudate, ati sadṛśam krāmati nainaṃ pāpīyān āpnoti'.*

[2] Op. cit. 506.

[3] Vol. II. 114.

In A. V. X. 3. 9, again, 'bhrātṛvya' has a similar significance. Here, the 'bhrātṛvya's are termed as 'sabandhavaḥ' (kinsmen) which clearly indicates that the rivalry of the 'bhrātṛvyas' was restricted to the family.[1] Keith and Macdonell are of the opinion that 'bhrātṛvya' perhaps expresses relationship here and so also Bloomfield (H. A. V.) though Delbruck and Whitney both prefer to interpret it as referring to enemies.

Further in Mantras, like VIII. 12. 2[2] and IX. 5. 31. 36, though the occurence of 'apriya' together with 'bhrātṛvya', emphasizes the inimical aspect of 'bhrātṛvya',[3] yet does not preclude the possibility of thinking 'bhrātṛvya' as one designated as a so-called brother, who may have been considered to be an object of special dislike by those related to him, since he belonged to a hostile group. The connection of 'arāti'[4] with 'bhrātṛvya' in X. 6. 1, may also be similarly explained. The various spells again aiming at destroying the 'bhrātṛvya' occuring in II, 18I,[5] would be more appropriate in the context of such brothers.

The meaning 'cousin' has found special favour with some scholars in the context of 'bhrātṛvya'. The validity of such an interpretation has eventually been discussed at length. Thus Delbruck argues that 'Pāṇini mentions 'bhrātṛvya' among the patronymics, and hence the Indian lexicographers have explained it in the sense of 'nephew' through 'bhrātṛja' (born of the brother); 'bhrātṛputra' (son of the brother); and 'bhrāturātmaja' (the progency of the brother). Similarly Boehtlingk and Roth too, have derived the sense' (Father's) Brother's son-cousin, for which one would have to suppose that the meaning 'cousin' had development in the dual and the plural uses’.[1] That the meaning ‘cousin’ is appropriate can be deduced on two grounds. In the first place, the current signification ‘rival’ is only explained in this way, (since) the ‘cousin’ represents that rank from which the struggle for inheritance starts. Secondly the suffix ‘vya’ points to it. Bhrātṛvya like ‘pitṛvya’, the one other (than the father) is a kind of brother, the other brother. It has to be supposed that at first the designation was limited to the brother’s son (in accordance with the composition of the family).[2] The authors of the Vedic Index also uphold that the sense of ‘cousin’ alone, fits in with the conception of a rival and ‘in an undivided family the relation of cousins would easily develop into rivalry and enmity[3].’ Weber even goes to the extent of finding a parallel in the much later conception of rivalry as that between Buddha and his cousin Devadatta, and equates ‘pitṛvyaputra’ (son of the uncle) in the Mālavikāgnimitraṃ of Kālidāsa (Act. I) with ‘bhrātṛvya’. Despite such argumentation, the cousin-interpretation does not seem justifiable, as it cannot be accepted in the context of the Brāhmaṇas. In these, it will be clear from the following investigation, that ‘bhrātṛvya’ conveys a totally different sense. It may, however, be suggested that Delbruck rightly infers, on the basis of a comparison between ‘pitṛvya’ and ‘bhrātṛvya’ that the latter means nothing more than ‘another brother’, but this ‘other brother’ is not essentially the same as ‘cousin’.

---

[1] 'Varaṇena pravyathitâ bhrâtrvyâ me sabandhavaḥ'.

[2] '*vṛścate 'syāpriyo bhrātṛvyo ya evam veda*'

[3] cf. Delbrueck—'sonst bedeutet es immer "Feind" theils in Verbindung mit 'apriya'.

[4] '*arātīyor bhrātṛvyasya durhardo dviṣatah śiraḥ api vṛścāmy ojasā*'.

[5] '*bhrātṛvya—kṣayaṇam asi, bhrātṛvya-cātanaṃ me daḥ svāhā*'.

Passing on to the Brāhmaṇas we find the growing influence of 'bhrātṛvyas' in the sphere of ritual. It becomes almost axiomatic with the Brāhmaṇakāras to interpret the successful performance of rituals, as inevitably leading to the conquering of the 'bhrātṛvyas'. Thus we find the phrase 'Parā-asyātmano bhrātṛvyo bhavati' repeatedly occuring in the Brāhmaṇas. It is certainly logical to argue that the conception of a 'bhrātṛvya' in the Brāhmaṇas in most places is tantamount to that of a rival or enemy.[1] Consequently Delbruck has aptly remarked that in the Brāhmaṇas the more exactly expressed 'bhrātṛvya' is the natural born enemy, who tries to oust the person, in particular the sacrificer, from his place (and deprive him of) his good fortune etc., which is due to him, and thus stands in relationship to him as the 'asura' to the God.[2] It is nevertheless, well-nigh impossible to maintain that 'bhrātṛvya' in the Brāhmaṇas had lost its former significance, and was only syonymous with 'rival', as there are some positive references in these texts which clearly reflect on the kin-like nature of the 'bhrātṛvya'. The silence of the commentators in this respect is of no consequence, as they usually quote later traditions.

---

[1] The dual and plural forms presume the sense of ‘cousin’ as the relationship between two ‘cousins’ cannot pe expressed in any other way than by referring to each other as ‘cousins’.

[2] P. rechnet ‘bhrātṛvya’ unter die Patronymischen Bildungen ; die Lexikographen erklaeren es durch ‘bhrātṛja’ ‘bhrātṛputra’ und ‘bhrātur ātmaja’ als “Neffe”. Danach haben Boethlingk—Roth als Bedeutung angesetzt “(Vaters) Bruderssohn, vetter”, wobei man also annehmen muesste dass die Bedeutung “Vetter” richtig angesetzt ist, ergiebt sich aus zwei Gruenden ; Erstens erklaert sich nur so die gelaeufige Bedeutung “Nebenbuehler” Der Vetter ist derjenige Grad bei welchem naturgemaess der Streit um die Erbschaft beginnt.” Zweitens sprieht dafuer dass suffix ‘vya’......Wie pitṛvya der andere... so ist ‘Bhrātrvya’ eine Art von Bruder, der andere Bruder. Dabei ist (wegen des Gesammtzustaendes der alten Familie) anzunehmen dass sich die Benennung zunaechst auf den Bruderssohn beschraenkt hat. p. 506—507-

[3] Op. cit.

Thus in the Jaiminīya passage quoted above in the contxet of 'jana' i.e. II.183-184 the equation of 'bhrātṛvya' with 'jana'. cannot be explained unless we consider both as members of a hostile group, to which the performer is related in some way.

Now, 'jana' (in the collective sense) of the sacrificer, as has been explained above, is inimical towards him inasmuch as it signifies the marriageable exogamous group with which he is conected through matrimony. Consequently the 'bhrātṛvya' may also be considered to belong to the same group, and, naturally be looked upon as an enemy. In that case 'bhrātṛvya' has to be interpreted as one among the kinsmen of the bride. Further the fact that the basic conception of 'bhrātṛvya' is 'brother', leads us to presume that the word probably designated the wife's brother or the brother-in-law.

---

1. cf. V. I. loc. cit.
2. loc. cit. (Ebenso in den Brāhmanas genauer gesprochen ist 'bhrātṛvya der natuerliche, geborene Feind, der dem Menschen insbesondere dem Opferer den Platz, das Glueck u.s.w. streitig macht, das ihm gebuehrt und ihm also ebenso gegenuebersteht. wie der Asura dem Gotte).

Two other passages also of the Jaiminīya provide confirmation for our conjection. In I.153-154[1] in the context of the Kāleya laud, we find the mention of two 'bhrātṛvya's, one possessing cattle and the other devoid of it. Among them, the one who owns cattle gains an upperhand over the other. (tasmād yat paśumāṃś-cāpaśuśca bhrātṛvyau spardhete, ya eva paśumān bhavati, sa eva tayor abhibhavati) Caland translates it by 'rival' (Nebenbuhler) as before. It is obvious that, what is meant to be emphasized here is that cattle-ownership was one of the basic reasons for rivalry between two parties in those days, but the specific use of the dual 'bhrātṛvyau' naturally leads us to an inference similar to that which seems inevitable in the context of the Saṃhitās.[2] 'Bhrātṛvyau', therefore, could be understood as signifying 'two brothers-in-law'. That the possession of cattle may have been one of the chief causes of enmity between such brothers-in-law, in the ancient days of the Brāhmaṇas, cannot be deemed as an impossibility,

In II.122-124 the occurence of 'bhrātṛvya' is highly significant. In the context of the Parikrī, here, it is stated that "the Kṣatra and the Viṭ (peasantry) support the Brahman. Analogous to them is the world of the 'bhrātṛvyas'. In that he separates the two (verses) he splits the world of the 'bhrātṛvyas. The wife and the child (or progeny) are dependent on one's own self. Analogous to them is the sphere of the 'bhrātṛvya's. In that he separates the two, he splits the world of the 'bhrātṛvyas'."[3] Caland seems not to have noticed the particular aspect of 'bhrātṛvya' here, and gives the usual rendering 'Nebenbuhler', although he adds in a note to it that 'the implication of these sentences is not very clear to him'.[4] It is almost inconceivable that 'bhrātṛvya' means nothing more than 'rival', even in the second part of the passages here where his sphere is considered as identical to the 'jāyā' and 'prajā'. That a sense of rivalry had come to prevail between the Kṣatra and Viṭ on the one hand, and the Brahman on the other is understandable since the growing influence of the latter in all spheres could hardly to tolerated by the othere two classes. The comparison, however, of the world of the bhrātṛvya's with the 'jāyā', presupposes that the former in this context is certainly a member of the same group as the wife. In other words, his clan is identical with that of the wife. With reference to 'prajā', on the other hand, the comparison seems unjustified, as among the descendants of one who obviously belong to the same clan as himself a 'bhrātṛvya' (coming from an alien clan) cannot exist. This anamoly can only be explained by the logical assumption that either it is a case of textual interpolation or that the compiler to whom the association of 'jāyā' with 'prajā' was too familiar, has failed to take notice of the apparent incongruity in connecting the bhrātṛvya' with 'prajā.

---

[1] D. J. B. in Answahl p. 46.

[2] cf. Delbrueck : Op. cit.—It may be pointed out that the form of address between brothers-in-law is similar to that between cousins.

[3] avalamba u ha vai brāhmaṇaḥ kṣatraṃ ca viṭ ca; kṣatraṃ co ha viśāṃ cānu bhrātṛvyalokaḥ, sa ye dve avaciccheda, bhrātṛvyalokam eva tad avaciccheda;...avalamba u ha vā ātmano jāyā ca prajā ca jāyām co ha vai prajāṃ cānu bhrātrvya-lokaḥ; sa ye dve avaciccheda bhrātṛvay-lokaṃ eva tad avaciccheda.

[4] 'die Absicht dieses satzes ist mir nieht vollkommen deutlich'. (D. JB. in A.—163)

In the other Brāhmaṇas 'bhrātṛvya' occurs frequently but there is possibly no other passage, which recalls to our mind the social implications of 'bhrātṛvya' as a term for kinship. Still in such compounds as 'bhrātṛvya-janman' or 'Bahu-bhrātṛvya' (S. B. 1. 6. 4. 18. etc.) and also 'abhrātṛvya' (A. B. 4. 2.), 'Bhrātṛvyavat' (A. B. 3. 7. S. B. 12. 7. 3. 4. etc.) one cannot deny that something more is meant than a 'mere rival'.

In this connection it may be interesting to refer to the explanation that Patañjali provides for the twofold conception of 'bhrātṛvya'. Commenting on Pan. 4. 1. 145 (vyan sapatne) he quotes the Vārtika which states that the use of 'vyan' is meaningless as there is the absence of the suffix-sense (vyan vacanam anarthakaṃ pratyayārthābhāvāt). Then he explains it thus: "the use of vyan is meaningless; why?—as there is the absence of the suffix sense?—what is this absence of suffix-sense?—that is the absence of the 'apatya' (progeny) sense. (The aphorism) 'Apatya etc.' is also applicable here, (but) the word 'bhrātṛvya' is used (appears) also in the sense of 'enemy' different from 'apatya' 'Pāpmanā bhrātṛvyeṇa' etc; the opponents may argue that where (the senses) ‘apatya’ and ‘enemy’ (exist) there ‘bhrātṛvya’ (is used) but how (do we justify) ‘inimical bhrātṛvya’ (Papmanā bhrātṛvyeṇa). (To this the answer is) it (the phrase) is correct, due to it (Pāpman) being that which compares—thus the bhrātṛvya (pāpmā) is like the ‘bhrātṛvya’ (apatya).[1] ‘Papmanā bhrātṛvyeṇa’, undoubtedly reminds us of the Brāhmaṇa references. It is not unreasonable therefore, to conclude that even to Patañjali ‘bhrātṛvya’ in the Brāhmaṇas had not lost its significance as a term for kinship. By ‘apatya’, however, he possibly means ‘the brother’s son’:[2]

Reference to the ‘bhrātṛvya’ is also not infrequent in the Śrauta Sūtras, but there is hardly any passage which could lead us to further inferences.

To conclude therefore, ‘bhrātṛvya’ both in the Saṃhitās as well as in the Brāhmaṇas has more than one meaning. In most of the passages it is merely a synonym of ‘rival’. In some, however, it possibly designates the brother-in-law. In an exogamous system, he would naturally be considered as being similar to a rival, in so far as he belongs to the hostile marriageable group’. The absence of a specific name for such a relative in the Brāhmaṇas, perhaps, provides some further evidence in favour of our hypothesis.

---

[1] “vyan vacanam anarthakaṃ kiṁ kāraṇaṃ ; pratyay-ārth-ābhāvāt : kim idam pratyayārth-ābhāvād iti, apatyārth-ābhāvāt. Apatyaṃ. iti vartate, anapatye cāpi sapatne bhrātrvya śabdo vartate ; Pāpmanā bhrātṛvyeṇa iti ; astu tāvad yad apatyam sapatnaśca tatra bhrātṛvya iti ; kathaṃ pāpmanā bhrātṛvyeṇa iti ; upamānāt siddhaṃ ; bhrātṛvya iva bhrātṛvyaḥ.”

[2] See above—the view of the lexicographers quoted by Delbrueck.

(D)

'Sajāta'

It is generally held by scholars that the relationship expressed by 'Sajāta' is not clearly defined in the Brāhmaṇas. It is true, that the ritualistic context of the latter, presupposes an amount of vagueness in matters not concerning the ritual in particular, although etymological derivations are found in abundance, which have no bearing on the ritual.

In the context of some passages, however, specially in the earliest Brāhmaṇas, it is possible to arrive at some definite conclusions with regard to the limitations involved in 'Sajāta', since they indicate more or less clearly the extent of kinship conveyed by this word. Here again it is primarily essential to consider its connotation in the Saṃhitās.

It occurs twice in the Ṛgveda.[1] In X. 103. 6.[2] *'sakhāyo* (friends) also appears which probably has a wider conception than that of 'sajāta'. Sāyaṇa interprets 'sajāta' rather literally, as 'born together', i. e. 'blood-related'. (he sajātāḥ sahotpannā yoddhāraḥ).[3] There is, however, nothing stated in the verse which may lead us to presume that such a form of relationship existed among 'sajāta's and that the distinction between 'sakhāyaḥ' and sajātāḥ is based upon the fact that while with the latter consanguinity is inevitable, it is not so in connection with the former.[4] In 1. 109. 1,[5] however, 'sajāta' alternating 'with 'jñāsa' has to be understood in a more precise manner *(vi hy akhyaṃ manasā vasya ichhann indrāgnī jñāsa uta vā sajātān)*. Sāyaṇa again lays emphasis on equality of birth and maintains that they (sajātas) are those relatives who are different from the 'jñāti's. (jñāso jñātīn uta vāpi vā sajātān samānajanmāno jñātivyatiriktā bāndhavāḥ). It cannot be denied that 'jñāsaḥ' occuring only in this verse in the Ṛgveda, has precisely the same sense as 'jñāti' which occurs more than once, but at the same time it is also known that even 'jñāti', which literally means 'acquaintance' (being derived from 'jñā'—to know)[1] also appears in the sense of 'brothers and sisters', related by blood, in X. 117. 9.[2] It is not clear, therefore, what Sāyaṇa implies by 'jñāti-vyatiriktāḥ'. If 'equal parentage' was the only common factor between one and his sajātas, 'jñātis' too, would be his 'sajāta's and jñāsa uta vā sajātān' in the verse would naturally be meaningless.

---

[1] Not once, as stated by the authors of V. I. Vol. II. 418.

[2] *'Gotrabhidaṃ govidaṃ vajrabāhum jayantam ajma pramṛṇantaṃ ojasā; imaṃi sajāta anu vīrayadhavam indraṃ sakhāyo anu saṃ rabadhvaṃ.'*

[3] 'Oh Sajātas—warriors, born together of equal parentage.'

[4] Grassman 'Verwandter' (W. Z. 1449)

[5] Grassman has referred to this verse also under Sajāta.

Geldner suggests 'verwandter und Standesgenossen',[3] implying that while in 'jñāti' (jñā), 'relationship' is emphasized, in 'sajāta', merely 'companionship' is expressed. That such an interpretation is possible cannot be denied, but perhaps, the point of emphasis here is that whereas 'Sajāta's were only members of the same clan, and kinship with them was resricted to the clan, 'jñati's could also specify those belonging to a separate clan, and presumably connected through matrimony. In other words 'jñāti's could be associated with the exogamous group, but there could be no 'sajāta' among those constituting that group.

In the Vājasaneyī, in I. 17, 'sajāta occurs side by side with Brahma (priesthood) and Kṣatra (nobility). Mahīdhara commenting on it interprets 'Sajāta' as the jñātis of the sacrificer, who are born in the same family'.[4] Again in V. 23 'sajāta' and 'asajāta' appearing together (yaṃ me sajāto yam asajāto nicakhāna) are interpreted by him as 'the brother born in the same family', and 'one not having equal parentage'. (samānajanmā bhrātā tad viparīto' sajātaḥ). That in this context too, 'sajāta' should be interpreted in the above sense is apparent, and the 'asajāta' should be interpreted as 'one not belonging to the same clan'. Mahīdhara's equation of 'sajāta' and 'sajātīya' in his commentary on XVII. 51,[5]

---

[1] cf. V. I. I. 291 ; W. Z. R. 502.

[2] 'jñati' cit santau na samaṃ pṛṇītah'—Grassman 'Geschwister'.

[3] D. R. 128.

[4] '*Dhruvamasi pṛthivīṃ drṃha-vani tvā ksatravani, sājatavany upadadhāmi bhrātṛvyasya vadhāyā—M. Sajātāḥ samānakule jātāḥyajamānasya jñātayaḥ.*'

[5] 'indra imam pratarāṃ ṇaya sajātānām asad vaśī'.

(sajātānāṃ samānajātīyānāṃ) however, is definitely impossible in the context of the Saṃhitās. It is rather interesting to note that Mahīdhara, with a lot of ingenuity tries to find all the three conceptions of 'kula' (family), 'janma' (parentage) and 'jāti' (caste) being involved in the significant word 'sajāta', but, unfortunately, it shows his inability to understand the restricted sense of 'sajāta' here, much as he was removed from the days of the Saṃhitās.

In the Kāṭhaka and the Maitrāyaṇī, both in the Saṃhitā and the Brāhmaṇa portions 'sajāta' is found in various contexts. Apart from the repetition of some 'mantras' already found in the V. S., there are some references, especially in the Brāhmaṇa portions, which indicate the importance of 'sajāta's in the context of rituals. Thus in the M. S. (II. 3. 2.) and K.S. (XII. 2.) we find a constant attempt on the part of the 'Yajamāna' to win the favour of the 'Sajātas' in connection with the 'Kāmya Iṣṭis'. It lays down that the sacrificer desiring overlordship of a village should try to capture the minds of the 'sajātas'; that he should offer with the 'Āmana' mantras (those beginning with 'Āmanasya devā ye sajātāḥ samānāsas tān ahaṃ kāmaye') thereby making the 'sajātas' friendly disposed towards him. These indeed are the 'sajātas' like those of the same clan, or sons, or wives or cattle; with these he connects himself. Further he wishes to be firmly established among the sajātas, to be loved by them, to be strong and conquer them.[1] It is apparent that 'sajāta' here is a generic term for all who claim kinship with the performer. The relation with 'cattle' would naturally amount to possession. The desire of the performer to appease the 'sajātas' or to vanquish them if possible, shows that some among them have a similar status whereas others are superior to him. This inference fits in adequately with the conception of 'sajāta' as clans-men. In the context of the Agnihotra the 'samāna's (equals) are equated with 'sajāta's ('ya evaṃ vidvān agnihotraṃ juhoti upāsya samānāḥ sajātyaṃ yanti),[1] which implies that the ‘equals’ of the sacrificer (in age, rank or status) are similar to his ‘sajātas’. Again in K.S. II. 1. 8, it is said that the ‘sajātas’ draw towards them the performer just as the calf pulls the udders (of the cow) or the cow (her)[2] calf. Thus in the Maitrāyaṇī and the Kāṭhaka we find a very close affinity with the ‘sajāta’s being essential for the sacrificer. It is difficult to avoid the inference, that the connotation of ‘sajāta’ is much more extended in these Saṃhitās than that found in the Ṛgveda and had little or nothing to do with the primary need of blood-contact.

---

[1] *Grāmakāmo yajeta manograhaṇaṃ vā etan manāṃsi vā etat sajātānāṃ samgṛhṇati......āmanena juhoty āmanasa evainaṃ karoti......ete. (vai sajātāḥ sajāta iva, putra iva, striya iva, paśava iva tair ātmānaṃ saṃyuṅkte......dhruvā hīyam dhruvo 'si dhruvas tvaṃ deveṣv edhi dhruvo'haṃ sajāteṣu bhūyāsaṃ ; priyaḥ sajātānāṃ ugraścettā vasuvid......ugro'haṃ sajāteṣu bhūyāsaṃ...... abhibhūrahaṃ sajātesu bhūyāsaṃ).*

In the Brāhmaṇa portions of the Taittirīya we come across a more explicit analysis of the mantras (paridhy-anumantraṇa mantra) in the already quoted context of M. S. (II. 3. 2) and K. S. (II. 2). In 1. 6. 10. 1, it is indicated that by reciting the Homa-mantras beginning with ‘Dhruvo’si’, he (the performer) makes the ‘sajātas’ secure, by those with ‘Ugro’ si’ he makes them harmonious; by that with ‘Abibhūrasi’ he repels him who acts against him, to bring about his ruin.[3] Sāyaṇa interprets ‘sajāta’ in the sense of jñāti’ or relatives in general, which, as we have seen before is not appropriate. On the other hand, Keith translates it as ‘equals’.[4] It is rather curious as is rightly pointed out by Keith, that the equation of the security of the Sajātas with the established state of the performer, ‘is not the natural sense of the verse’, and this method of interpretation is not applied to the next Mantra. The only possible explanation lies, perhaps, in assuming that the ‘sajātas’ mentioned in the first ‘mantra’‘ are equal to him or inferior to him in rank, and whereas the ‘sajātas’ among whom he wishes to be the powerful one or the conquering one, claim a higher status. The explanation ‘ya evainaṃ pratyutpipīte’ is significant as it indicates that even among the members of the same clan quarrels were not infrequent. Keith, rendering it as 'equals', leaves the meaning of 'sajāta' rather vague. Yet another passage in the Taittirīya which throws further light on the precise meaning of 'sajāta' is II. 3. 9. Here in the context of the Saṅgrahaṇī iṣṭi (one of the Kāmya iṣṭis) it is stated that with the words 'Thou art affection, O, ye gods of affection,' he (sacrificer or the offerer) offers three oblations; so many are his 'sajāta's who are great small and women, them he wins (*etāvanto vai sajātā ye mahānto, ye kṣullakā yāḥ striyas tānevāvarunddhe*). Keith translates 'sajāta' again as 'equals' as, according to him, "the primary sense of 'a man's relatives' gave way to the general sense of 'equals of whatever rank they and he may be.'[1] Sāyaṇa still takes it in the sense of the 'related ones', though in a very extensive way.[2] He construes 'mahāntaḥ' (great) as those who are the elders in one's own family, jāti or village, 'kṣullakāḥ' (small) as the younger members and 'striyaḥ' as 'wife, sister, mother and others like them'. The passage is very similar to those in the M.S. and the K.S. quoted above, and probably the same significance is to be attached to it. Sāyaṇa's interpretation is also reminiscent of Mahīdhara's explanation in the context of the Yajurveda. It is, however, important that 'kṣullakāḥ' and 'mahāntaḥ' here refer directly to the superiors and inferiors in one's own clan. 'Striyaḥ' probably denotes the women-folk in the M.S. passage, as well as here, and points to the fact that even the female members of the clan were considered to be 'sajāta's. Thus in the Taittirīya 'sajāta' means nothing more than 'clan-fellow'.

---

[1] M. s. I. 8. 7; K. S. VI. 6. 8.

[2] ‘*yathā vatsa ūdhar abhyacchati vatsaṃ vā gaur evam enaṃ sajātā abhyayacchanti*’.

[3] ‘*Dhruvo ‘si dhrvvo ‘haṃ sajāteṣu bhūyāsaṃ ityāha, dhruvān evainān kuruta; ugro ‘sy ugro’ haṃ. sajāteṣu bhūyāsaṃ ityāha prativādina evainān kurute: abhibhūrasy abhibhūrahaṃ sajāteṣu bhūyām etyāha; ya evainam pratyutpipīte tam upāsyate.*’

[4] ‘V. B. Y.’ (trans.) 93. Vol. I.

In the Atharvan, we find the idea of 'enemy' connected with 'sajāta' in certain mantras. Thus in I. 19. 3 we have *'yo naḥ svo yo aranaḥ sajāta uta niṣṭhyo yo asmān abhidāsati; Rudraḥ sarvaiv-aitān mamāmitrān vi vidhyatu'*. Though the verse only suggests the possibility of even a 'sajāta' being an enemy, yet for the first time in the Saṃhitās, 'sajāta' positively stated as 'amitra' hints possibly at the fact that disputes were becoming rather more frequent among the sajātas; Sāyaṇa understands 'sajāta' here either as 'of equal birth', 'of equal strength’ or ‘kinsmen’ or ‘enemy’[1] which proves that he is uncertain about its sense in this verse. The parallelism between ‘sva’ and ‘sajāta’ on the one hand and ‘araṇa’ and ‘niṣṭhya’ on the other is certainly indicative of the ‘sajāta’s being members of one’s own clan. The meaning of ‘niṣṭhya’, however, is not very clear. In 1. 10. 4.,[2] however, the sense of ‘rivals among one’s fellows’ fits in more with ‘sajāta’ than the rendering of Sāyaṇa : ‘warrior-instructors marching along with the army’ (sajātān sahacāriṇaḥ śikṣakān bhaṭān). In the other mantras (e.g. III. 3. 4; III. 3. 6: III. 8. 2: XI. 1. 6. etc.) ‘sajāta’ occurs only in the sense of ‘relatives’, the degree of relationship being not specified, and Sāyaṇa’s interpretation of XVIII. 4. 37,[3] shows only the reflection of his times (sahajanmānaḥ samānakule jātā gotṛṇaḥ).[4]

---

[1] V. B. Y. (trans.) I. 7.

[2] "svakule, svajātiṣu madhye svagrāme ca ye mahāntaḥ puruṣāḥ prauḍhāḥ; kṣullakāḥ, bālāḥ, striyaḥ patnī bhaginī mātrādayaḥ".

In the main Brāhmaṇas, it appears frequently and though the sense implied by it seems to be well-understood in those days, yet there are a few passages in the Tāṇḍya, Taittirīya, Jaiminīya and the Śatapatha, which indirectly explain the status of the ‘sajāta’.

To commence with, ‘sajāta’ occurs in the Tāṇḍya in the context of the Pṛṣṭha lauds, : ‘Sarveṣāṃ vā etat pṛṣṭhānāṃ tejo yad udvaṃśīyaṃ tasmādvā etat purā sajātāya nākran pāpavasīyaso vidhṛtyai—(VIII. 9. 7.), meaning that which is the Udvaṃśīya laud, is lustre (the most effective) among all the Pṛṣṭhas, and hence formerly they (the Udgātṛs) did not apply it for the ‘sajāta’ in order to keep sin and virtue apart. Sāyaṇa explains it as referring to a known (jñātāya) ‘yajamānā’ implying thereby one related to the present performer. He explains the separation of vice and virtue as: ‘kimarthaṃ, pāpapuṇyayor asāṅkaryāya, yasmād udvaṃśīyaṃ karoti, sa vasīyān bhavatyeva; atas tathāyaṃ jñātīnāṃ bhaved iti vṛddher abhi prāyaḥ’.[5] Caland translates the above passage as :......... ‘therefore they formerly did not apply it for a tribesman in

[1] “tathā anyo’pi sajātaḥ samāna-janmā samabalaḥ jñātiḥ arātirvā”.

[2] *‘sajātān ugreha vada brahma cāpa cikīhi naḥ—’*

[3] *‘idaṃ kaśāmbu cayanena citaṃ tat sajātā ava-paśyateta’*.

[4] “of equal birth, born in the same family, possessing the same gotra”.

[5] “What for ?—For the purpose of keeping vice and virtue apart ; in that he applies the udvaṃśīya, he makes himself pious and also among the jñātis this is the import of vṛddhi (vidhṛti ;)”.

order to hold apart the good and the bad' and annotates; (i) "A tribesman, 'sajāta,' who seeks equal or greater influence than the sacrificer", and (ii) 'If he were to apply for the rival the Udvaṃśīya which means lustre, the good (prosperity) would fall to the share of the rival'. Apparently Caland thinks 'a rival tribesman' is meant here by 'sajāta' an idea met with, as shown above, even in the Atharvaveda. Weber, however, translates it as: "Vormals brauchte man das udvaṃśīyaṃ (sāma), welches das Licht aller pṛṣṭha ist, nicht for einen sajāta, Gleichgebornen."[1] i. e. "formerly the 'udvaṃśīya" (sāma) the light of all Pṛṣṭhas was not used for one of the same age."

It cannot be denied that the prevalence of a sense of fear in the all-round prosperity of the 'sajāta' is easily deducible from the above passage. The applying of the 'udvaṃśīya' for the 'sajāta' would lead to a rise in his rank, which is not the specific purpose. The sin (pāpa) in this context refers to the lack of the fulfilment of purpose by the result or merit accruing to the 'sajāta' instead of the 'yajamāna', and the merit (vasīyas) refers to the achievement of purpose by the growth in prosperity of the latter. It seems that a sense of rivalry between one and his 'sajāta's is inferrable here, but the very fact that the injunction is laid down specifically for 'sajāta' indicates that the rival belongs to the same clan as the performer. Caland's translation 'tribesman' is again rather vague, and 'fellow-clansman' fits in more with the context.

In the Jaiminīya, the passages mentioning 'sajāta' are particularly interesting. In I. 271 in the context of the application of the Dhūr verses, Āṣāḍha Sāvayasa is stated to have been asked by the Brahmavādins in the midst of discussion, as to how he had attained the position of the Grāmaṇī (village headman) of the Sārkarākṣas, to which he replied: 'In the Dhūr verses verily, I have acknowledged (obtained) it; (they questioned again) 'what is it that thou hast attained in the Dhūrs', to which he replied 'The Jāta'; (they continued) 'what does he become who obtains the 'Jāta' of these' (verses); (he answered) 'Wherever there is a sajāta, there (happens) to be a Grāmaṇī'. They said; 'This is how you are'.[1] In this, the points to be noted are the meaning of 'jāta', its connection with 'sajāta' and the association of the latter with the Grāmaṇī. Caland translates 'jāta' as 'the born one' (Das Geborene), in accordance with its literal sense, and it is not clear to him what this word means, specially in this context. (was 'jātaṃ' hier besagt sehe ich nicht recht).[2] He renders 'sajāta' as 'Angehoeriger' (relative) and hints at the possibility of a "word-play here with 'jāta'". (Wortspiel mit dem vorhergehenden jātaṃ ?).

---

[1] I. S. X. 156.

It may be suggested with regard to the interpretation of 'jāta' that later on, in this very passage 'jagatī', which is the metre of the verse in question here, is equated with 'abundance' (bhūman) and 'procreation (prajātim), which presumably are equivalent to 'jāta', as 'prāṇa' (breath) and 'kṣatra' (nobility) are to 'priya (dear) and 'śrī' (prosperity) of the first two verses in gāyatrī and tṛṣṭubh, respectively.[3] Now, 'abundance' and 'procreation' are symbolic of growth, and 'jāta' possibly signifies the same idea. 'Sajāta' coming after it leads to it being a more specified word for expansion within the clan. In other words, the clan grows by the preponderance of 'sajāta's. Grāmaṇī, here probably signifies the chief of the clan, and hence his connection with the clansmen is presupposed.

In another instance in the Jaiminīya (I.337, 338) contempt is expressed for the 'sajāta'. In the context of the stobha of the Śyāvāśva melody, it is mentioned that the "vailūnayaḥ" brought to their Samiti (assembly), the *jaimava*[4] 'sajāta,' he of the king Prasenajit Kausalya; him they called with the Śyāvāśva melody; 'O come, Eh ! come; lower in status is this sajāta, he causes his own ill-luck to reach him in that he sings: 'O come'[1] Caland understands 'sajāta' here as a fellow-tribesman (Stammgenossen) and leaves 'jaimava' untranslated. 'Jaimava' does not appear anywhere else in the Brāhmaṇas, and hence it is almost impossible to find out what it implies. It is, however, fairly clear that it indicates the status of the particular 'sajāta' mentioned in this passage. Caland's interpretation of 'hīna' as 'left behind' (zurueckgelassen) is too literal. It is certainly the lower rank of the 'sajāta' which is emphasized here. The rendering 'fellow-tribesman' too, does not bring out the type of kinship that presumably exists between Prasenajit and his 'sajāta'. That a closer affinity lies between the two is undeniable. It is, therefore, more reasonable to translate it, as in the passages above, as 'fellow-clansmen'. The reason for the censure of the 'sajāta' by the Vailūnis (as is to be inferred from the passage) is not clear as the identification both of the Vailūnis, and the 'sajāta' is not possible merely on the basis of this passage.

---

[1] "Atha hocur āṣāḍhaṃ sāvayasaṃ yat tvaṃ śārkarākṣāṇāṃ vāva grāmanyevāsi, kena tvaṃ idaṃ prāpitheti sa hovāca dhūrṣv evāhaṃ tad upāsa iti, kim tvaṃ tad dhūrṣupāssa iti ; jātam iti ; ya āsām jātam upāste kiṃ sa bhavatiti ; yatraiva sajāto bhavati tad grāmaṇīr bhavatīti............".

[2] Op. cit. 106.

[3] 'prāṇo vai gāyatrī ; prāṇo vai priyaṃ ; kṣatraṃ vai tṛṣṭup, kṣatraṃ vai śrīḥ'.

[4] Has it any connection with 'Jāmi' ? A rather striking anamoly if proved in the context of the Sajāta.

In the Taittirīya we find, the recurrence of some mantras which occur in M.S., where 'sajāta' is again expressive of close-relationship. In III.7.12.2., in the context of the Mantras to be recited by the sacrificer at the commencement of the performance of the Agniṣṭoma, with a view to purification[2] the fourth mantra runs: 'Oh Jātavedas (Agni) deliver us from that sin, committed unconsciously with reference to the gods, through 'Sajāta-śaṃsa' or 'Jāmi-śaṃsa', the śaṃsa' of the elder or of the younger: "*sajāta-śamsād uta vā jāmi-śaṃsāt jyayasaḥ śaṃsād uta vā kanīyasaḥ; anājñātaṃ devakṛtaṃ yadenaḥ ; tasmāt tvāṃ asmān jātavedo mumugdhi* : - M.S.IV.14.17).[3] 'Śaṃsa' is according to Sāyaṇa 'praise' (stuti) whilst 'sajāta' refers to 'kinsman, equals in age, friends' (samāna-janmāno jñātayaḥ samāna-vayaskāḥ sakhāyo vā) and 'jāmi' stands for 'wife' (jāmayo jāyā bhāryāḥ). The authors of the Vedic Index maintain, on the other hand, that the reference is to 'disputes among the 'sajātas' and

---

[1] "taṃ haitam śyāvāśvenaiv aiho vā ehi yā ity udāhvayan; hīna iv-aiṣa yat sajātaḥ ; sa yad aiho vā ehi yā iti gāyati svenaiv-aitat tat pāpmanābhyāroh (a)yata iti."

[2] cf. Sāyaṇa: 'agniṣṭomādau ekaviṃśatyā darbhapuñjīlaiḥ havyamānasya yajamānasya japārthāḥ mantrā ucyante'.

[3] See above under 'Jāmi.'

'family disputes', taking 'śaṃsa' in the sense of imprecation.[1] Jāmi-śaṃsa fortunately occurs also in A.V.II.10.1., and also in another context in the Jaiminīya—(evam ahamimaṃ kṣetriyāj jāmiśaṃsāt; druho muñcāmi varuṇasya pāśāt). In the former verse Sāyaṇa proposes for 'jāmi' the sense of 'relatives', and interprets 'jāmi-śaṃsa' as referring to 'the sin resulting from the crying aloud of the relatives, who wish to attain that which they have not obtained' : (1) 'bandhavo jāmayaḥ aprāptābhilaṣitānāṃ teṣāṃ śaṃsanāt ākrośa-janitāt pāpāt;'. In the latter passage, however, he thinks that it conveys the sense 'indicative of sloth' : (2) ālasyaprakhyāpakāt). In view of this difference in the interpretation it is difficult to decide what he apprehends by 'sajāta-śaṃsa' and 'jāmi-śaṃsa'. It is, however, more likely that Bloomfield's translation 'curse of a kinswoman'[2] is more apt in this context as far as 'jāmi' is concerned, since it is already pointed out that this word refers to the non-marriageable group. 'Śaṃsa', probably means the chant performed in an improper manner by the 'sajāta,' or the 'jāmi' or others, without the knowledge of the performer. In that case the gods are invoked for protection against the sin committed by these, who belong to the same clan as himself. Thus 'jāmi-śaṃsa' should be translated as 'the chant of those belonging to the non-marriageable group', and 'sajāta-śaṃsa' as 'the chant of our clansmen'. This, however, in the long run weakens the 'sajātas', keeps out the 'jāmi's, stamps the ambitious schemes of the elders and the younger ones leading to the prosperity of the sacrificer. Anyway, whichever view we may adhere to with reference to 'śaṃsa', it is apparent from this passage, that there is a difference between the conception of 'sajāta' and 'jāmi' in the sense that while the former merely comes from the same clan, the latter not only comes from the same clan, but is also beyond the range of marriage. It is in fact a difference in emphasis, one connected with the clan, the other with the non-exogamous group.

Lastly in the Śatapatha we find quite a number of passages wherein 'sajāta' occurs. Sāyaṇa here too, as in the other Brāhmaṇas, interprets it in various ways. Thus in I.2.1.7.

[1] Vol. I. 285 ; Vol. II. 419.

[2] H. A. V. 14.

in the context of the setting or placing of the kapālas (potsherds) in the Agnihotra, the Brāhmaṇakāra explains the Mantra '*Sajāta-vanīti*' as 'abundant are the Sajātas, thus he prays for abundance: (Sajāta-vanīti bhūmā vai sajātās tadbhūmānam[1] āśāste), Sāyaṇa equates it with Jñātayaḥ'.[2] In I.9.1.15. in the context of the Sūktavāka, Śaṃyuvāka etc., it is stated that 'in the Sajāta-vanasya hymn, he glorifies the breaths, as the 'sajātas' are like the breaths; one is born with (sahajāta) the breaths' ('tat sajāta-vanasyām āśāsta iti; prāṇā vai sajātāḥ prāṇair hi saha jāyate tat prāṇān āśāste). Sāyaṇa has here "sajātas are 'brothers', the breaths are one's own, and 'sajāta-vanasyā' is the lack of separation between the performer and them" (sajātā bhrātaraḥ ātmikāstu prāṇāḥ teṣāṃ ca tasya sambhaktistair aviyogah sajāta-vanasyā). In these passages we see that a relationship between the sacrificer and the 'sajātas' is implied but at the same time there is no indication towards blood-relationship. There is one more passage in the Ṣatapatha, which brings in once again the connection of the Grāmaṇī (village chief) and the 'sajātas.' In the context of the passing round of the 'Sphya' (sacrificial swords) during the performance of the Rājasūya, it is stated that the 'Sphya' is handed over to the king, further to the 'Sūta' or 'Sthapati', who in turn hands it over to the Grāmaṇī, who then passes it over to the Sajāta. It is also mentioned that this passing over has for its purpose the weakening of the receiving party. Thus the Grāmaṇī, by handing it over to the 'sajāta' with the Mantra, 'you are the thunderbolt of Indra, serve me herewith' makes the 'sajāta' weaker than himself; the reason for their handing over in this manner is that they do so in order that there may not be confusion, and it may remain as before.[3] Eggeling annotates on 'Sajāta' thus: 'The sajāta would seem to be one of the peasant proprietors or 'sharers' constituting the village-brotherhood ruled over by the headman and often actually belonging to the same family as the latter (Gaugenosse, clansman).[1] It can, however, be safely inferred here, on the basis of the statement in the Jaiminīya ('yatraiva sajāto bhavati tad grāmaṇīr bhavati) quoted above, that the 'sajāta' even in this context is related to the 'Grāmaṇi' in the sense that he comes from the clan to which the latter belongs. It may be argued that the 'sajāta' in this context is one of the relations of the 'Grāmaṇī', who assists him in managing affairs connected with the clan or the village. That the 'sajāta' should be subordinated by the clan must have been demanded by the chief of that clan. Finally in the Taittiriya II.7.18.5.' the close connection between the Grāmaṇī and 'sajātas' is expressly stated: 'vyatiṣakto vai grāmaṇīḥ sajātaiḥ'.

---

[1] cf. Jaiminīya—'jāta', above.

[2] Eggeling—'kinsmen'—S.B.E.XII.

[3] 'taṃ grāmaṇīḥ sajātāya prayacchati; indrasya vajro'si tena me rādhy—eti tena grāmaṇīḥ sajātam ātmano' baliyāṃsaṃ kuruṭe tad yad evaṃ samprayacchante net pāpavasyasam asad, yathāpūrvam asad iti tasmād evaṃ samprayacchante, (V. 4.4.19). Eggeling gives rather a free translation—'they do so lest there should be a confusion of classes, and in order that (society) may be in the proper order, S.B.E.XLI. III.

The Śrauta Sūtras have practically nothing to say on 'sajāta', as probably by that time the conception of 'samāna-jāti' had come to prevail, which though totally absent in the Brāhmaṇas, was a logical outcome or derivation from the older idea of 'sajāta.'

From this comparative analysis, we may conclude that the word 'sajāta' was restricted in its sense in as much as it referred to those only with whom kinship was claimed within the clan. The argument of Keith, referred to above, that 'sajāta' gradually came to imply 'equals' of whatever rank he or they may be is justifiable to some extent, but that even in the Brāhmaṇas the 'primary sense' of the word was not altogether lost, cannot be denied. It is not certain how far blood-relationship was conveyed by 'sajāta' but that it was involved in it to some extent is obvious, and it is in this strain that it can be translated best as 'fellows', or, 'fellow-clansman',[2] specially in the context of the Grāmaṇī. It seems also fairly plausible that it conveys a sense almost similar to that ot 'samāna-jana'.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] As has already been done by Keith in some contexts, but not always.

CHAPTER IV

SOCIAL AND FUNCTIONAL GROUPS

The background of the differentiation between the social and functional groups in society is well known to those familiar with the Saṃhitās and the Brāhmaṇas. The memorable work of Zimmer, which is the only one of its kind to deal with the social life in particular, is really indispensable to forming an idea of the social frame-work in the age of the Saṃhitās. There are some incidental references to the Brāhmaṇas in it from this point of view, which are not without significance. Weber and Winternitz, Keith and Macdonell have also attached much importance to this classification, a knowledge of which is essential to framing up a picture of the Vedic society in toto. Some of the recently published works, again present a more detailed analysis of the problem. The inferences drawn in these from some of the Brāhmaṇa excerpts are, however, far from being justifiable. It is, therefore, worth while reconsidering the interpretation which is still a matter of controversy.

Social Groups

As far as social groups are concerned, the situation is fairly simple, and the facts may be stated in outline. In the Śatapatha appears the off-quoted statement : 'the Varṇas are four; the Brāhmaṇa, the Rājanya, the Vaiśya and the Śūdra : (catvāro vai varṇāḥ; brāhmaṇo rājanyo vaiśyaḥ śūdro.[1]' It is significant that 'jāti' in the later sense of 'caste' is not known to the Brāhmaṇas, and it is difficult to decide whether 'varṇa' in these texts is better applicable to 'class' or 'caste'. We find, however, that the Ṛgvedic division of 'varṇa' into the 'ārya' and the 'dāsa' is replaced here by that of the Ārya or the Daivya and the 'asurya'. In the context of the Mahāvrata, the symbolic striving of the Ārya (or Arya) and the Śūdra on a piece of a round hide, results, according to the Tāṇḍya[2] in the victory of a member of the Ārya caste (Śūdrāryau carmaṇi vyāyacchete tayor āryaṃ varṇam ujjāpayanti). The Taittirīya,[3] in the same context states that the Brahman represents the divine Varṇa, and the Śūdra that associated with the Asuras (daivyo vai varṇo brāhmaṇaḥ asuryaḥ śūdraḥ) and in the struggle the Brahman is victorious (brāhmaṇaḥ sañjayati).

Among these four varṇas, the eminence of the Brahman, and the servility of the Śūdra are fully established. The Tattirīya[4] refers to the Brahmans as veritable gods. The Śatapatha mentions them as 'human gods' (manuṣyadeva). "The woman, Śūdra, the dog and the blackbird are, according to the latter, 'untruth', and are not to be seen (anṛtaṃ strī śūdraḥ śvā kṛṣṇaḥ śakunis tāni na prekṣate)".[5] It again prescribes non-communication with a Śūdra for the consecrated, stating that, should there be occasion for him to converse with a Śūdra, let him say to one of these (the Brahman, Rājanya and Vaiśya) 'Tell this one so and so'.[1] The Aitareya lays down that the 'Brahman is higher than the kṣatriya' (bhūyān vai brāhmaṇaḥ kṣatriyād), and the Śūdra is 'the servant of another, to be removed and beaten at will', (anyasya preṣyaḥ kāmotthāpyo yathā-kāma-vadhyo.).[2]

---

[1] V. 5, 4. 9.

[2] V. 5, 14.

[3] I. 2, 6. 7.

[4] 'ete vai devāḥ pratyakṣaṃ yad brāhmaṇāḥ'.

[5] XIV. 1. 31.

The Rājanya and the Vīś or Vaiśya are mutually interdependent. It is usually the Rājanya who subordinates the Vaiśya, as the latter is said to be subservient and not refractory to the nobility (kṣatrasyaiva tad viśaṃ kṛtānukarāṃ anuvartamānaṃ karoti).[3] Further, in the Aitareya[4] the Vaiśya-like progeny of the Kṣatriya who drinks curds, is described as 'anyasya balikṛt' (a tributary to another), 'anyasyādyaḥ' (to be lived upon by another) and 'yathākāma-jeyaḥ' (to be oppressed at will). According to the Tāṇḍya, however, 'the Rājan' (king or Kṣatriya) is the child (embryo) of the Viś (people or Vaiśya), (viḍ vai saptadaśas tasyā rāja garbho),[5] who could expel him (aparuddha-rājanya). This implies that the peasantry was sometimes more powerful than the nobility.

The precedence of the Brahman over both the Rājanya and the Viś is clearly stated : The Kṣatra and the Viś are made subject to the Brahman (brāhmaṇa eva kṣatrañca viśañcānuge karoti).[6] At some places, however, we hear of the Brahman following the Rājan (not necessarily the king)—'brāhmaṇo rājānam anucarati,[7] and his being an object of respect after the Rājan (tasmād brāhmaṇo rājānam anu yaśaḥ).[8] In the Taittirīya, the Rājanya is spoken of as 'doing much that is untruth and one of his evil deeds is stated to be 'the conquering or subjecting of the Brahman.'[9]

---

[1] 'Yadi enaṃ śūdreṇa saṃvādo vinded eteṣāṃ evaikaṃ brūyād imam iti vicakṣv enam iti.' III. 1. 1, 10.

[2] VII. 1. 29.

[3] S. B. xiii. 2. 2. 15.

[4] Ibid.

[5] II. 10. 4.

[6] P. B. II. 8. 2; XI. 11. 9; XV, 6, 3.

[7] S.B. I. 2. 3. 3.

[8] S. B. V .4. 2. 7.

[9] See passage quoted above under 'Jāmi'.

These passages and many such like show that the supremacy of the Brahman was not fully accepted by the Rājanya.

Regarding the inter-relation between the Vaiśya and Śūdra it is apparently impossible to infer from the passage (quoted above) in the Tāṇḍya describing the Mahāvrata, that the necessity of clearly distinguishing the Aryan Vaiśya from the Śūdra, who was a doubtful Aryan[1] ,was clearly felt in those days, since the expression 'Ārya-Varṇa' is understood only by the commentators on the Sūtras, in the sense of a Vaiśya, and may not necessarily be the view of the Brāhmaṇakāra.

It may be interesting to note here, that in the Taittıriya it is laid down in the context of the Māhendra sacrifice, that the 'agata-śrī' should not perform the Māhendra sacrifice; three are the 'gataśarī's, the learned (Brahman), the Grāmaṇī and the Rājanya' (nā'gata-śrīr māhendram yajeta: trayo vai gataśriyaḥ; śuśrūvān grāmaṇiḥ rājanyaḥ).[2] Similarly in the Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa 'gataśrī' appears in the context of the milking of the cow, during the performance of the Agni-hotra; "the udders of the cow facing the east should be milked by the oldest among brothers, the son of the eldest among the co-wives, or whoever is a 'gataśrī', while those facing the west should be milked by the youngest, or the son of the youngest among the co-wives, or one who wishes to be established.' (purvau duhyāj jyeṣṭhasya jyaisṭhineyasya, yo vā gataśrīḥ syāt aparau kaniṣṭhasya kāniṣṭhaneyasya; yo vā bubhūṣet.)[3] Here, according to the Sūtrakāras, 'yo vā bubhūṣet' refers to the 'ānujāvara' who may be compared with the 'agata-śrī' in the Saṃhitās. It is rather strange that the word should be taken by commentators to convey the idea of the 'prosperous one',[4] since in accordance with its form, it should signify the reverse. Possibly, they have interpreted it in conformity with its derivation in the Kāṭhaka, the Maitrāyaṇī and the Taittirīya in their treatment of the Ekādaśa-rātra. The justification for the

---

1. cf. V. A. 450.
2. II. 5. 4. 4.
3. II.1.8.1.
4. cf. Sāyaṇa—'prāpta-śrīkaḥ'.

drawing of the Śukra cup first by the 'gata-śrī', according to those texts, lies in the fact that the 'the Śukra is yonder sun, this is the end, man having reached the end of prosperity stops; from the end indeed, he grasps the end, and thenceforth does not resort to evil'. Śukrān gṛhṇīta gataśrīr, asau vā ādityaḥ śukra, eṣo 'anto' ntaṃ manuṣyaḥ śriyo gatvā nivartate, antād evāntaṃ ālabhate, na tataḥ pāpīyān bhavati).[1] A similar explanation is found in the Śatapatha where, in the context of the kindling of fire, during the performance of the Darśapūrṇamāsa, it is stated that 'the verses should be recited for the 'gataśrī' by one who wishes neither to attain prosperity nor be degraded: 'Ta haita gataśrer enānubrūyād ya icched na śreyānt syām na pāpīyān'.[2] The only inference that we can derive from these interpretations is, that 'gataśrī' denotes 'one who is well established'.[3] As it is peculiar to the Brāhmaṇas in this sense, it may be considered to have been of primary importance in the context of rituals, as was also the case with 'Ānujāvara' and 'Bhrātṛvya'. The learned Brahman, the Grāmaṇī[4] and the Rājanya (presumably the warrior-chief or king naturally came to be designated as the 'gataśrī's, as they were the thriving ones in their own classes.

---

[1] Kat.—XXX.3.T.S. VII.2.7.; cf. M.S.III.8.3.; 9.1.etc.

[2] 1.3.5.12. cf. Eggeling XII. 98, who also quotes the Kāṇva version, which is 'much briefer and clearer'.

[3] cf. Eggeling 'one of established prosperity' and Keith—'prosperous one'—V.B.Y. (trans.) 19.

[4] According to the Śatapatha, he is usually a Vaiśya (Vaiśyo vai grāmaṇīḥ). V.3.1.6.

Functional Groups

Among functional groups,[1] most of which are known to us from the lists of victims at the Puruṣamedha in the Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā and the Taittirīya (Brāhmaṇa), those of the 'rathakāra' and the 'takṣan' raise interesting issues. The 'Takṣan' (carpenter) appears in the Ṛgveda as 'wishing to break wood into pieces' (*takṣā riṣṭam rutaṃ bhiṣag brahmā sunvantam icchati*.[2] Again in the Atharvaveda, he is mentioned as the 'skilful worker with the axe': "*sikvaḥ parāvadhīt takṣā hastena vāsyā*".[3] There is no reference to the 'rathakāra' in the Ṛgveda. In A.V.III.5.6., however, 'the intelligent 'rathakāras' (chariot-makers) are described as the 'upasti's (dependents) of the king, together with the "clever karmāra's" (smiths)[4]

In the Saṃhitās of the Black Yajurveda,[5] in the context of the offerings to Rudra, the 'takṣan's and the 'rathakāra's are placed in close proximity (*namo namas takṣabhyo rathakārebhyaśca*), obviously, due to their occupations being alike.

In the context of the Puruṣamedha, the 'rathakāra' is clearly distinguished from the 'takṣan' inasmuch as the former is to be consecrated to 'skill', and the latter to 'perseverance': medhāyai rathakāraṃ, dhairyāya takṣāṇaṃ'.[6] It may be inferred from this that the 'rathakāra', being employed specially for the making of chariots was far more accomplished than the ordinary carpenter who turned out wood-work of a cruder type.[1]

---

[1] Some of these are also found in the śatarudrīya litany in Kāṭ. S.XVII.12.13; Kap.S.XXVII.3; M.S.II.9.3.4.4.5; V.S.XVI. 21—28; T.S.IV.5.

[2] IX.112.1.—'taṣṭṛ' (identical in sense), however, appears more than once—I.61.4; 105, 18; 130.4. etc.

[3] X.6.3.

[4] '*ye dhīvāno rathakārāḥ, karmārā ye manīṣiṇaḥ; upastin parṇa mahyaṃ tvaṃ sarvān kṛṇv abhito janān*. Sāyaṇa's interpretation of 'dhīvānaḥ' as 'mātsyikāḥ' (fishermen) is rather doubtful, though the authors of the Vedic Index accept it, since the usual word for fishermen is 'dhaivara' or 'dhīvara'. The Paippalāda recension has '*ye takṣāṇo rathakārāḥ karmārā ye manīṣiṇaḥ* (III. 13.7).' Here, obviously difference is made between the carpenter and the chariot-maker.

[5] cf. V.S.XVI.27.

[6] XXX.6; T.B. III. 4.2.1.

Among the references[2] to the 'takṣan' in the Brāhmaṇas, that in Ś. B. I. I. 3. 12., merits consideration. Here in the context of the new and the full-moon sacrifices, in connection with the sprinkling (of water) on the sacrificial vessels (yajña-pātrāṇi prokṣati) it is stated : 'whatever of these (gods) is touched by the impure carpenter, or one not fit for sacrifice, that he (performer) purifies by (sprinkling) water (on it)'—'tad yadevaiṣām atrāśuddhas takṣā vānyo vāmedhyaḥ kaścit parāhanti tadevaiṣām etad adbhir medhyaṃ karoti'. This is the only passage in the Brāhmaṇas which refers to the impurity of the carpenter, who makes the sacrificial vessels thus rendering them impure by his touch. The reason for such an impurity is not clear, but it seems possible that there may be a connection with an earlier idea of offence to the woodland spirits in the desecration of the tree.[3]

With reference to the 'rathakāra' on the other hand, the Taittirīya prescribes the mantra ; 'Oh Lord of vows, (Agni), I place thee with the vows of the Ṛbhu gods' for performing the Agnyādhāna (placing of the fire), according to the deity' : 'Ṛbhūṇāṃ tvā devānāṃ vratapate vratenādadhāmīti rathakārasya yathā-devatam agnir ādhiyate.[4] Sāyaṇa, in this context, raises the query whether 'the chariot-maker is a Brahman (Kṣatriya or Vaiśya) or some one else, and answers that he could be a Brahman etc., if it (the word rathakṛt) is broken up into its component parts, but through convention a different class (is meant), and for his 'ādhāna' the rainy season[5] is mentioned'. (viprādir eva rathakṛd anyo vā ; 'ādyo' stu yogataḥ, rūḍher varṇāntaraṃ ; tasyādhāne varṣartur-ucyate). The same question is discussed by Jaimini in his Pūrva-mīmāṃsa Sūtras (VI. 1. 44. 50). According to him the 'rathakāra's are 'Saudhanvan's who represent a caste below the Vaiśya but superior to the 'Śūdra'.[1]

---

[1] In the R.V., however, the making of chariots also was associated with the 'takṣan' (see V.I.I.297).

[2] G.B.I.2.21; Ś.B.II.3.1.31; III.6.4.4.; J.B.II.269.72.

[3] This view has been suggested by Professor Brough. It must be noted that in the case of the chariot-maker this impurity would not apply, since the latter may be held to work in dead or cut-wood, thus giving no offence to the spirits of the trees.

[4] T.B.I.1.4.8.

[5] cf. K.S.S.—'varṣāt prajāpaśukāma-vaiśya-ratha-kṛtam.

It is logical to conclude from this that the Rathakāra being placed after the Brahman, Rājanya and Vaiśya, and having a special Ādhāna-mantra represents a different class, and has the right to perform sacrifices. It is, however, far from possible that he is a Śūdra, as in the Brāhmaṇas, a member of the fourth class is clearly stated to be 'ayajñīya' and 'videva'. Again, apparent from the statement in the Śatapatha[2] with regard to the residence of the Brahman who knows not of the Aśvamedha, in the house of the rathakāra, that he is a man of consequence.[3] Thus it seems possible that the Rathakāra was originally held to be a man of specialised importance, possibly even as a sub-division[4] of the Vaiśya. Later, with the wider spread of skilled labour through the community, and the consequent loss of his unusual position, there follows the steady decline of the esteem in which he is held, and his subsequent relation to the lower non-Aryan caste.[5] There is certainly no evidence for the urge of the offspring of the union between the Karaṇī (the daughter of a śūdra woman through her Vaiśya husband) and the Māhiṣya (the son of a Vaiśya woman and a Kṣatriya man), Brāhmaṇas.[6]

---

[1] cf. Kane—H.Dh.S. Vol. II.1.45.

[2] 'teṣāṃ ratha-kāra-kula eva vo vastis tad hy aśvasya āyatanamiti'.

[3] cf. V.I.II.266.

[4] cf. Ibid. 265.

[5] This conjecture differs from that of the authors of the Vedic Index who see the reason for this decline in the growth of a revulsion against manual labour.

[6] Yāj : I.95.92. Kat. 4.9.5.

CHAPTER V

THE VRATYA PROBLEM

One of the most interesting and intricate problems that strikes us, while studying the social conditions of the Vedic age, is undoubtedly that of the Vrātyas. To all Indologists interested in the Vedas, it has been a matter of prime importance to endeavour to solve what Hauer has rightly referred to in his comprehensive work 'Der Vrātya', as 'das Vrātya-Raetsel'. The abstruse nature of the passage which mentions the Vrātyas in particular, coupled with the apparent contradictions found in their conception in texts which are not probably much separated chronologically, has led scholars to approach the problem from many angles resulting in the accumulation of a mass of analytical material, ranging from brief reviews to prolonged theses. The answer to this riddle, however, is still uncertain.

An attempt has been made by Hauer in his work to state briefly the widely-divergent views of scholars who have preceded him in studying this problem. The list is a fairly complete one, as it takes into account most of the former interpretations, that have appeared in journals and bulletins both in the West and the East, from the time of Weber, when Vedic research was in its infancy, down to his days. As there have been some more Vedic interpreters in the East, who have tried to explain the 'vrātya' references in the vrātya texts, in a totally different manner, even after the appearance of Hauer's treatise, a better and more complete review will hardly be considered to be superfluous. Moreover, a further analysis of the subject would be meaningless without a detailed treatment of the contributions of those who had formerly studied it in extenso.

1. *Critical Review of past investigations.*

Weber, as has been noticed by Winternitz and Hauer, was the first orientalist to refer to passages in the Tāṇḍya Mahābrāhmaṇa dealing with the sacrifices of the Vrātyas, the Vrātyastomas. In the very first part of the first volume of his 'Indische Studien' he quoted excerpts from the seventeenth chapter of this Brāhmaṇa, and added his own translations. It was suggested by him, that these Vrātyastoma passages were of special significance with regard to the date of composition of the Tāṇḍya. He understood the Vrātyastomas as special ceremonies, through which Indians of Aryan origin, but not living according to the Brahmanical system, obtained admission into the Brahman community (die Ceremonien abgehandelt, durch welche arische, aber nicht brahmanische lebende Inder in den brahmanischen Verband Eintritt gewinnen).[1]

In the same volume also appeared Theodor Aufrecht's well-known edition and translation of Book XV. of the Atharvaveda which is usually known as the Vrātya Book. A. V. XV, as Lanman claims "was the first book of the Atharvaveda to be translated in any occidental language".[2] Annotating generally on A. V. XV, Aufrecht added that the word 'Vrātya' was not to be met with anywhere else in the Atharvaveda and can possibly be derived from 'vrāta' occuring in A. V. II. 9. 1; Y. V. III. 55 etc., having the sense of 'multitude'. He further referred to Patañjali's explanation of 'vrāta' on Pāṇ. V. 2.21, mentioned the statement of the scholiast on Pāṇ. V. 3.113. on the existence of the Vrāta families e. g. the Kapotapāka and Vrīhimata, quoted Mahīdhara's interpretation of 'vrāta-saha' in Y. V. XXIX. 45 (vrātān śūra-samūhān sahate), and pointed out the mention of the 'vrātya' in the context of the Puruṣamedha in Y. V. XXX. 8. Lastly he surmised that the Vrātya Book was probably a common glorification of the Upanaya i. e. the entry of the Vrātya himself, of his own accord, into the community of the Aryans ("das Vrātya-buch sei eine allgemeine Verherrlichung des dem Upanaya, dem Eintritt in den Verband der Ārya, sich unterziehenden Vrātya").[1] Are we to infer from this that he considered the Vrātyas to be Non-Aryans ?

---

[1] I.33

[2] Whitney-Atharvaveda (Trans.)—Introduction to Book. XV.

In his lectures on the History of Indian Literature, again for the first time, Weber discussed the position of the Vrātyas as they appear in the Atharvan Saṃhitā and the Sūtras. A. V., in his opinion, 'mostly originated in the Brahmanical period, yet songs and formulae may have beed incorporated which properly belonged to these un-Brahmanical Aryans of the West', and 'a very peculiar relation to these tribes is revealed in the XVth book, where the Supreme Being is actually called by the name of 'Vrātya' and at the same time associated with the attributes that are peculiar to the Vrātyas in the Sāmaveda. Similarly in the Ātharvaṇa Upaniṣads the word is employed in the sense of 'pure in himself', to indicate the Supreme Being'.[2] Dealing with the Sūtras of the Sāmaveda he pointed out that the Śyena sacrifice, applying only to the Vrātīnas in the Ṣaḍviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, should be connected with non-Brahmanical western Vrātyas who are considered to be on a par with the eastern non-Brahmanical, i. e. Buddhistic teachers, as Lāṭyāyana in his Śrauta Sūtra mentions the converted Vrātyas as transferring their former impurity to a Brahmabandhu Magadha-deśīya.[3] It is clear from this that Weber tried to connect the Ātharvaṇa Vrātya with the Vrātyas and Vrātīnas of the Brāhmaṇas and the Sūtras. It seems from his way of arguing, that he understood 'Magadha-deśīya' of Lāṭyāyana as 'one belonging to Magadha in the east'.

Böhtlingk and Roth, however, argued differently. They derived 'Vrātya' from 'vrāta' and defined it as 'one belonging to a roving band', a 'vagrant' or 'one moving about' or 'member of a fellowship that was outside the Brahmanical pale' (einer schweifenden Bande angehoerig, Landstreicher; Mitglied einer Genossenschaft, welche ausserhalb der brahmanische ordnung steht).[2] Further with reference to the Ātharvaṇa Vrātya, they denied the relationship between him and the Vrātyas of the Brāhmaṇas and the Sūtras. In their opinion the praise of the Vrātya in the XVth Book of the A. V. has for its purpose, only to idealize the pious vagrant or the wandering religious mendicant (Den Preis des Vrātya in A. V. 15 betrachten wir als Idealisirung des frommen Vaganten oder Bettlers 'parivrājakas'). In other words they held that the Vrātyas were merely nomadic tribes, having no connections with the Brahmans.

---

[1] Op. cit. I.139,

[2] Lit. Ges. (Trans.)—112.

[3] Op. cit. 76; Tr. 78.

Zimmer reffered to the Vrātyas and the mixed castes while discussing 'State and Law in the Vedic period'. He stated clearly that the Vrātyas belonged to a distinct social order, though they owed allegiance to the Brahmanical State. They were Aryans, who generally did not subordinate themselves to the Brahmanic order, and like some other tribes found their abode to the west of the Sarasvatī.[1]

Rajaram Ramkrishna Bhagvat was, perhaps, the first to exmine in detail the position of the Vrātyas with special reference to the 17th chapter of the Tāṇḍya Mahābrāhmaṇa. He viewed the problem in a totally different manner, and evidently worked upon the hypothesis that the Vrātyas were originally Non-Aryan tribes and their habitat was probably in the East (Bihar). To put it in his own words, "the graphic description of Vrātya life as found in the Tāṇḍya, clearly establishes that the Vrātyas originally represented some Non-Aryan tribes. Their peculiar outfit, as described in the Brāhmaṇa is enough proof of their being semi-civilized. In the Sūtra period they are known to have acknowledged the three-fold division of society into the 'educated', 'the highborn and the wealthy'. 'This division coupled with their faith in the three Vedas, according to him, gave impetus to 'the Aryan plan of assimilation by conversion, which may have been suggested to them by the need for expansion'. Further, 'the Vrātyas failed to stand against the Aryans due to the lack of a cohesive force within them, and retired ignominously from the unequal contest leaving the combined Aryan masters of the field. He again suggested the possibility of some Aryans being called Vrātyas due to their free associations with the 'licentious or gay Vrātya women' as can be inferred from the fact stated here, that a class of Vrātyas were named 'Śama-nīca-meḍhra'. Thus it appeared to him that the word 'Vrātya' had a triple significance in the Vedas, e.g., Non-Aryan, semi-civilized and the licentious Aryan. Concluding, he pointed out that in spite of the fact, that today in Mahārāṣṭra the Vrātyastomas are completely forgotten due to the unpopularity of the Sāma-Veda among the Mahārāṣṭrī Brahmans, and the Brahman priest hardly knowing how to perform it for himself or for others, curiously enough, the word 'Vrātya' is "still preserved in the sense of 'naughty', 'unmanageable', 'playing pranks' in the every-day language of the Maratha people".[1] It is difficult to say precisely to what extent the description in the Tāṇḍya represents such facts, as shall be clear, later on when the Brāhmaṇa evidence is examined. The use of the word in present day in Marathi is certainly not based on its occurance in the Brāhmaṇas, as the modern sense given to it, agrees more with the interpretation of the later Smṛtikāras.

---

[1] P.W. See under Vrātya.

[2] Alt. Leben—216.

Hillebrandt in his Ritual--Literatur,[2] explaining the one-day sacrifices (Ekāhas) had also something to say on the Vrātyastomas and the Vrātyas. He, however, took into account only the passages in the Tāṇḍya on them and also the Sūtras. A.V.XV. was, strictly speaking, beyond the scope of his ritualistic study of Vedic literature. He quoted the later conception of Vrātya as 'Sāvitrī-patita' (fallen from or deprived of Sāvitrī), found in Manu, Yājñavalkya etc. He sided with Weber in maintaining that they belong to the non-Brahmanical groups of tribes, especially to those who were to be admitted into the Brahman community. He had no theory of his own, and restricting his findings to the purely philological sphere, gave a wholly factual analysis of the Vrātyas and their sacrifices. He also accepted Weber's translations of the references to the Vrātyas in the Brāhmaṇas. His contribution to the problem through the presentation of concrete data from the Brāhmaṇas and the Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, gives a further

1. J.B. (Br). R.A.S.—Vol. 19 357 ff.
1. G. Ia. Ph.—Bd. III. Hft. 2.—1387f.

basis, as Hauer rightly remarks, to Weber's deduction that the Vrātyas should be associated with countries to the East of the land of Brahmanical culture, like Magadha etc.[1]

Lanman in his introduction to Whitney's translation of A.V.XV., brought out the statement of the Anukramaṇī which significantly connects the Vrātya with Brahman, as one of its many forms, and puts him on a par with the 'brahmacārin', 'skambha' and the 'palita', using all these terms in the same verse. The latter have been extolled, he mentioned, in A.V. (XI.5; X.7,8; IX.9. etc.). Further he referred to the penultimate verse of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, which states that the remains of the sacrifices offered either to the outcast or the Omnipresent, All-soul are of equal merit, only if the offering is done with the 'right knowledge' and surmised that 'a similar idea' is perhaps expressed in A.V.XV. Much more valuable was his considered opinion: 'In spite of its puerility and surface-obscurity the book (A.V. XV.) is not unworthy of a searching investigation' which made the study of the Vrātya problem almost imperative with later Indologists.

Bloomfield, in his earlier work 'Hymns of the Atharvaveda' had gone to the extent of stating that both the books XV and XVI were of 'doubtful quality and chronology'. In his later contribution—'Atharvaveda and the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa',[2] though he abided by his former view in calling the contents of Book XV., still 'too absurd for analysis', yet was compelled to deal with our problem. He was of the same opinion as Lanman in taking the theme of this book to be in reality 'Brahman', though section 5 introducing the 'mūrtis' of Rudra was, according to him, certainly under Śivaitic influence. He interpreted Vrātya as—a Brahmacārin or at any rate one who has entered the Brahmanical community after having been converted from an Aryan but non-brahmanical tribe'. Again the Vrātyastomas described at length in the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras were, in his estimation, rites which 'make it possible for an unholy half-savage community (cf. Pañca-Viṁśa Br. 17.1. —2) to become Brahmans'. He also pointed out the reasonable connection of A.V.XV. and PV.Br.17.1-4, and concluded that the Vrātya 'having become holy enough, through his acquired 'brahmacaryaṃ' is emphatically the reperesentative of Brahman; like the Brhamacārin he is apotheosized'.

---

[1] Der Vrātya.—p.15. This deduction of Weber is purely based on Lāṭyāyana's reference to 'prācya-ratha' (the car of the easterners) and (Magadha-desīya) in connection with the Vrātyastomas. Thus, according to him, the Vrātyas originally came from the West, but were mixed up with the Eastern Vrātīnas afterwards.

[2] G. Ia. Ph.—1909—94.

Hopkins, about the same time, in his treatment of the 'Gods and Saints of the Great Brāhmaṇa',[1] made a passing reference to the Vrātyas and recalled Weber's statement on the chronological position of the Tāṇḍya Mahā-Brāhmaṇa. He indicated further, that, the Vrātyas were probably 'a host of still non-Brahmanized outlaws, vagrants who wander about in a sort of gypsy wagon'. Clearly he was influenced by the interpretations of Böhtlingk and Roth.

R. P. Chanda incidentally referred to the Vrātyas and Yatis in his article on the 'Survival of the Pre-historic civilisation of the Indus Valley'.[2] He found the existence of two classes of non-Brahman magician-priests in the Vedic and the proto-historic periods, e. g. the Vrātyas and the Yatis respectively in Vedic literature. He also agreed with Roth in maintaining that the prototype of the mystical Vrātya was the wandering or religious mendicant, while the Vrātya himself was 'a true Sādhu', a Siddha-puruṣa', who 'acquired the highest occult powers'. Further, in his opinion, A. V. XV. 8., shows the close connection of the Vrātya with the Kṣatriya caste, and A. V. XV. 3., indicates that he practised Yoga; the Yatis were probably the fore-runners of the Vrātyas and the aim of the Vrātya sacrifices described in the Brāhmaṇas was to incorporate within the Brāhmaṇa caste a class of religious mendicants who were occasionally employed as priests in non-Vedic and indirectly even in Vedic sacrifices.[3] Finally he supposed that with the growing popularity of Vedic religion the Yatis receded into the background and were gradually reduced to the position of the out-casted religious mendicants or Vrātyas.

With Bloomfield and Hopkins we probably reach the end

[1] Trans. Con. Aca.—XV.

[2] M.A.S.I.—41.

[3] cf. A.V.XV.2.

of the first phase of the process of research on the Vrātyas. The second phase is represented by others holding totally different views. Before we pass on to the next stage, it is necessary to analyse the opinions of these former scholars, and ascertain how far they help us in understanding the true life and character of the Vrātya. Thus, critically viewing the deductions of Weber, Aufrecht, Bōhtlingk and Roth, Zimmer, R. R. Bhagavat Hillebrandt, Lanman, Bloomfield, Hopkins and R. P. Chanda, we find the main points of emphasis are : (a) the tribal aspect of the Vrātya derived from 'vrāta' used in the sense of 'multitude'; (b) the Aryan or non-Aryan character of the Vrātyas; (c) their non-Brahmanical practices; (d) their location on the fringes of the East or West ; (e) their assimilation in the Brahman community through the right performance of the Vrātyastomas ; and (f) an underlying connection between Vrātya of A. V. XV., the 'Vrātīna' of the Ṣaḍviṃśa and Lāt. Śr. S., and Vrātyāḥ' of the Pañcaviṃśa. Bōhtlingk and Roth denied the tribal aspect and also the Vrātya-Vrātīna connection. Hopkins characterized them as outlaws. Bhagavat thought them to be non-Aryans. Lanman and Bloomfield took them to be outcasts and members of a half-savage community respectively, and equated the Atharvan Vrātya with the Brahmacārin as one of the forms of Brahman. Weber, Aufrecht and Zimmer unhesitatingly defined them as western non-Brahmanized Aryan tribes. R. P. Chanda connected them with the Yatis. The only point on which all have agreed, with but one exception, is that regarding the Vrātya as a Non-Brahman Aryan.

The second phase is represented by the investigations of J. Charpentier, K. Chattopadhyaya, Keith and Macdonell, Winternitz, Hauer, N. N. Ghosh, B. L. Mukerji, D. R. Bhandarkar and A. P. Karmarkar.

In his essay on Rudra-Śiva, Charpentier studied the Vrātya problem from quite a different angle. Here,[1] he described the Vrātyas, as a band of people not governed by the rules of caste, probably representing the worst elements of Indian society,—the thief, the robber, the highway marauder, the drunken one etc. He suggested, further, a probable connection of these with the wild tribes in the Vindhyas e. g. the Bhils, the Pulindas, the Śabaras etc., and surmised that originally they may have been members of the Pre-Aryan autochthone tribal groups, but their later association with the highly civilised rulers and nobles inhabiting the eastern part of India, especially the State of Magadha, such as the Licchavis in Vaiśālī, the Mallas in Pāvā and Kuśīnara, seems strange. The only explanation, in his opinion lies in taking them to be the ancient worshippers of Śiva, connected with a religion that the orthodox Brahman priests and law-givers have hinted at, already in the period of the Ṛgveda with abhorrence.[2] The Vrātya hymns of the Atharvaveda appeared to him as 'nothing more than a small collection of psalms for the Śiva. devotee (Um zu den Vrātya-Hymnen des Atharvaveda...eine kleine Psalmensammlung der Śiva Vereher enthalten), as is clearly deducible from the 1st 'paryāya' of A. V. XV. In his later 'Bemerkungen ueber die Vrātyas', he studied the problem in greater detail. In this article he examined most of the sources dealing with the Vrātyastomas, ranging from the Tāṇḍya to the works of Manu and Yājñavalkya. He translated and critically annotated the relevant passages in the Tāṇḍya, as well as the fifteenth book of the A. V. His main conclusions were: (a) the Vrātyas are the originators of the wide-spread Rudra-Śiva cult and spiritual predecessors of the ancient and modern Śivaites; (b) the Vrātyastomas are rites to mark the entry of these into the Brahman community, looked upon suspiciously by the orthodox fellows; (c) the Atharvan Vrātya is identical with Rudra-Śiva; (d) the gṛhapati of the Vrātyas mentioned in the Brāhmaṇas and the Sūtras is also comparable with Rudra-Śiva as is clear from the similarity between his dress and the imagined outfit of Rudra.

---

[1] W.Z.K.M. Vol. 23.151ff.

[2] W.Z.K.M. 25—355ff.

Keith found it difficult to agree with Charpentier's viewpoint and subjected his inferences to severe criticism,[1] reviewing his contribution in as much as it presented a solution to the problem. Thus he pointed out: (a) Manu's reference to the Rājanya Vrātyas, e. g. Licchavis and Mallas (X.22) has no value for Vedic times; (b) Tāṇḍya XVII. 1.1., cannot have any connection with Śat. 1. 7. 3. 1., as Dyutāna Māruta could not be identified with Śiva; the equation of the Vrātya gṛhapati with Rudra-Śiva was impossible as the similarity of apparel is not supported by textual evidence; (d) no confirmation could be found in the Atharvaveda for the Vrātya-Rudra identification, as A. V. XV., is only a 'late piece in Brāhmaṇa style' and it is natural to find theological speculations in it. Further, 'Bhava', 'Śarva', 'Rudra', 'Paśupati', 'Ugradeva' and 'Īśāna' are all forms symbolic of the cosmic potency of the Vrātya, and have no bearing on his original nature. He also indicated certain fundamental difficulties not explained by Charpentier's interpretations: (1) the total absence of any rite in Vedic religion in which a certain deity, who is conceived of here as the Supreme Brahman, is supposed to be received in to the order of the orthodox deities; (2) Rudra-Śiva was not out of the pantheon of gods in the Brahman period (cf. Śatarudrīya of the Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā); the dreadful conception of the Ṛgvedic Rudra leading to that of Rudra-Śiva in the Brāhmaṇa period, does not imply that Rudra-Śiva was a strange god, unknown to the Brāhmaṇakāras; (3) certain characteristics of the Vrātyas mentioned in the P. ñcaviṁśa remain unexplained in the Rudra-Śiva context, e. g. non-practice of agriculture and trade, different code of law and difference in language.

---

[1] J.R.A.S. 1913.

According to authors of the vedic Index,[1] the Vrātyas are outcastes and the Pañcaviṃsá speaking of the Vrātyastomas, refers to four different types of outcastes, though, those belonging to the first category (that of hīna) alone, were 'really important Vrātyas, others being subsidiary'. Again, they could not be Non-Aryans (as suggested by Bhagavat), as they are expressly stated (in the P. B.) to have spoken the tongue of the consecrated, though they were unconsecrated, and also because they 'probably had a somewhat Prākṛtiç form of speech'. Further, in their opinion the view that they were Aryans was more confirmed by the fact that they were allowed to become members of the Brahman community by performance

---

1. Vol. II. 342ff.

of the Vrātyastomas, which could hardly be natural in the case of the Non-Aryans. The locality of the Vrātyas, which could be either in the East or west of the Sarasvatī does not provide additional help to solve the problem, and A. V. XV., treats the Vrātya 'in so mystical a way that he is represented as being in all quarters'. They did not accept Roth's interpretation of this mystic Vrātya[1] and agreed with Bloomfield and Lanman in imagining the purpose of A. V. XV., to be limited to 'exalting the converted Vrātya as a type of perfect Brahmacarin and in so far, of the divinity'.[2]

K. Chattopadhyaya, in his two articles entitled 'The Boghazkoi inscriptions and their value for Vedic chronology',[3] and 'Dionysus in Megasthenes',[4] suggested that the Aryans who were wandering about in Asia Minor between 2,000 B. C. and 1,500 B. C. should be associated with the Vrātyas, who were Aryans, had entered India from the North, as the Vāj. Sam. in the context of the Puruṣamedha (human sacrifice) mentions the Gandharvas and Apsarasas together with the Vrātya, which implies that he was a Northerner.[5] He limited the date of their arrival in India to the beginning of the Brāhmaṇa period, as A. V. XV., Pv. Br. Vāj. S. (XXX) and the corresponding 'portion of it in the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa', in which we find the earliest mention of the Vrātyas are ascribed to this period. He further maintained that the Vrātyas leading a nomadic life formerly, were deeply concerned with their religion, though they never performed sacrifices, and it was after some time, that they were 'overcome' by the 'glamour' and 'convinced' of the superiority of Vedic sacrifices and the Vedic way of life, and thought of entering the Brahman—Vedic fold through the performances of the Vrātyastomas. He also contended that the Atharvan Vrātya was no converted Vrātya, but one 'still a Vrātya and fresh from his northern home'. He concluded:

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Op. cit. 343.

[3] C.R. 1924—287ff.

[4] IIIrd. Cr. Conference. Madras,—1925. 261ff.

[5] This inference is probably based on a supposed connection of the semi-mythical Gandharvas and Apsarasas with the tribes of the north, which is clearly impossible.

'whether they actually invaded India is not known, they may have only sneaked their way into the land like gypsies'. In his second article he referred to the expression'daivā vrātyāḥ' appearing in the Tāṇḍya XXIV. 18 and proposed that they should be looked upon as she original Vrātyas appearing in a deified manner and represented possibly the early Aryan immigrants. These two articles, as we see from the way of argumentation were attempts to solve the problem on a political basis.

'Die Vrātyas', a short discussion on 'the Vrātyas' of Winternitz,[1] should certainly be deemed to have made distinct contribution towards a synthetic study of our problem. Formerly referring to A. V. XV., he had stated that 'composed in prose it is probably one of ritualistic origin, a kind of mystically complex glorification of the Vrātya, i. e., those Non-Aryans who were brought into the Brahman caste, and the sayings (mantras) were connected probably with a ceremony through which this admission of the Non-Aryan Vrātya into the Aryan Brahmanical society was accomplished.[2] Here again, with regard to the Vrātyastomas, he stated that they were of special interest being sacrificial ceremonies through which one belonging to a nomadic (wildly living), (possibly) non-Aryan tribe, was admitted into the Brahman caste'[3] : In the article stated above, he studied the problem and on the basis of all the textual sources that deal with the Vrātyas, came to certain tentative conclusions. He started by analysing the views of others who preceded him and in particular criticized those of Charpentier and J. W. Hauer.[4] "Etymologically", he conjectured, 'vrātya' could be derived either from 'vrāta' (religious vow) or from 'vrāta' (band) :

---

1. Zeit. fuer Bud. VI. 311f.

2. Ges. Ind. Lit.—130., (Rituellen ursprungs ist wahrscheinlich auch das in Prosa abgefasste XV Buch. Es ist dies eine mystische verworrene Verherrlichung des Vratya, d.h. des in die Brahmanenkaste aufgenommenen Nichtariers: und die Spruche wurden wohl bei einer Zeremonie verwendet, mittelst welcher dicse Aufnahme vollzogen wurde'.

3. Ibid.—166. 'Opfer-zeremonien durch welche Angehoerige wildlebender, vermuetlich nichtarischer Stamme in die Brahmanen kaste aufgenommen wurden'.

4. **Hauer's 'Die Anfaenge der Yopapraxis' had already appeared by this time, which shall be dealt with later on.**

(Etymologisch kann 'vrātya' entweder von 'vrata' (religiose Pflicht), (Brauch), oder von'vrāta' (Schar), (Bande), abgleitet werden"). He, however, was of the opinion that both 'vrātya' and 'vrātīna' should be derived from 'vrata' and not, as Bloomfield thought, from compounds like 'anyavrata' (cf different vows) or 'apavrata' (fallen from vows) etc., and indicated that Pān. V. 2. 21 and Patañjali's comment on it, confirm the derivation. His inferences were : (a) the Vrātyas could not be distinguished from the Vrātīnas as Lāṭyāyana mentions the Vrātya stomas of the Vrātyas and the Śyena sacrifice of the Vrātīnas in close proximity ; (b) it was clear from the testimony of the Brāhmaṇas and the Śrautasūtras taken as a whole, that the Vrātyas were people who remained outside the Brahmanical Caste-system, led a sinful life according to the orthodox Brahmanic conception, roamed about in bands, had a strange carriage, were robber-like leaders of hosts, and had their own social organisation, but, at the same time enjoyed a certain amount of respect from Brahmans who admitted them into their socio-religious order; it was difficult to answer the question whether the Vrātyas were Aryans or Non-Aryans, but, nevertheless, whatever is said about their way of life and behaviour points more to a Non-Aryan origin, and on the evidence of a certain circumstance (Lat.'s reference to 'prācya-ratha', the eastern wagon') at least, it could be held that they belonged to the east.[1]

Discussing the theme of the hymn A. V.X. V., he argued as Lanman and Bloomfield had already inferred that on the one hand it was a glorification of the Brahman—the highest godly and cosmic principle, and on the other, that of the heavenly Vrātya (also mentioned in the Brāhmaṇas), who here seems to be identical with Rudra, Mahādeva and Īśāna. The praise of the divine Vrātya, according to him, leads to the reflection on the earthly Vrātya, that in agreement with A. V. XI. 5., where the Brahmacārin is glorified as the Brahman, the divine Vrātya-Rudra-Mahādeva here, is praised as being identical with the Highest Being, and then in a vague way connected with the earthly Vrātya. Further he maintained that the earthly Vrātya of A. V. XV., 'is none other than the Vrātya who through the Vrātyastoma sacrifice, was already admitted into the Brahmanical community ; (Der letztere ist aber kein anderer als der Vrātya, der durch das Vrātyastoma-Opfer schon in die brahmanische Gemeinschaft aufgenommen worden ist.)

---

[1] Op. cit. p.55-56. (Ob sie Arier oder Nicht-Arier waren, laesst sich nicht entscheiden. Was uber ihre Tracht und ihre Lebensweise gesagt ist, deutet eher auf nichtarische Stamme hin. Einige Umstaende weisen darauf hin das sie dem Osten angehoerten.)

Criticizing Charpentier's assumption that the 'gṛhapati' and the Vrātyas remind us of Rudra-Śiva and the Śaivaites, and that the former may be Rudra himself, on grounds of the similarity of outfit,[1] he suggested that it was quite probable that the order may have been the reverse. In other words Rudra as the holy Vrātya or the God connected with forests and mountains was presented with the equipment of the ancient Vrātyas residing in mountains and jungles.[2]

Examining Hauer's theory that the Vrātyas were wild ecstatics and the ancestors of the Yogins of to-day,[3] he made it clear that the inferences drawn from the Atharvan references to the colour of the Vrātya's turban and hair, his dress, his moving out in the heavenly directions, his standing on one foot for a year, his kingship, his royal retinue etc., in close analogy with the Yoga practices of the wild ecstatics, are too far-fetched. Especially he pointed out that the connection of the Yogin, with the 'puṃścalī' and the 'Māgadha' was impossible. In his opinion 'the Māgadha is better known from Indian literature than through the practices of these wild ecstatics',[4] and the Yogin has hardly anything to do with the Fertility rites (Aber was hat der Yogin mit dem Fruchtbarkeitszauber zu tun ?). Hauer's understanding of the Brāhmaṇa phrase 'adiksitā dīkṣita-vācaṃ vadanti' in his estimation, may be correct, but 'speaking the language of the initiated does not, however, concern all the Vrātyas, but only the initiated Gṛhapati who has to perform the ritual functions'.[1] Further Hauer's surmise that 'the Vrātyas were habitual poison-eaters like some present day Yogins, and that they had for their daily nourishment, hot rice-gruel cooked, perhaps, with brandy, which was only eaten at sacrifices in the Brahman culture-brotherhood' on the basis of the Brāhmaṇa phrase 'garagiraḥ vā ete' and 'jányaṃ annam adanti' had not, as far as he could judge, been implied in the texts.[2]

---

[1] Ibid-above.

[2] Op. cit. p. 58 (Konnte as nicht vielmehr umgekehrt sein, dass Rudra als der himmlische Vratya und als der mit Waldern und Bergen enge zusammenhaengende Gott in der Ausstattung einigermasen den in Bergen und Dschungeln Wohnenden Vrātyas ahnlich dargestellt wurde ?).

[3] See below.

[4] Aber wer der Magadha ist, wissen wir doch wirklich aus der indischen Literatur besser, als aus der Praxis der Wildekstatiker.

Winternitz concluded rather pointedly, saying 'the clever and imaginative conclusions of Hauer had something fascinating in them, and had at first fascinated me also, but on closer examination they were found not to be based on facts.'[3]

Next, B. L. Mukerjee had contributed three articles[4] in this connection in which he had attempted to survey briefly the Vrātya texts. In his first article 'the Vrātyas add their sacrifices' he had dealt with the two main Brāhmaṇa texts, e.g., the Pañcaviṃśa and the Jaiminīya, making a few improvements on the older interpretations of Śayaṇa, Weber and Charpentier of passages in these Brāhmaṇas mentioning the Vrātya-stomas, which we shall discuss later on. He had come to the conclusion that 'Vrātya-stoma, is a social or religious penance for those who have in some manner or other defied or neglected religious law and order'.[5] In his second article entitled 'the word 'vrā', in the Ṛgveda', going through the Ṛgvedic verses containing the term 'vrā' he had examined the interpretation given to it by Yāska, Sayāṇa, Wilson, Griffith, Langlois, Ludwig, Grassman and Oldenberg, and in agreement with Yāska had suggested that it meant 'hunter' (cf. Durgā—'Lubdhaka'), and not 'troops or host' or even 'the female' as thought by others. (Ibid. p. 177). His last

---

1. Op. Cit. p. 59.
2. Op. cit. p. 60.
3. Ibid. (Ich gestehe, dass diese gestreichen und phantasievollen Ausfuehrungen etwas Bestechendes an sich haben und zuerst auch mich anzogen, aber bei naherem Zusehen feehlt ihnen doch der Boden der Tatsachen).
4. J. A. S. B. Vol. 21.
5. Op. Cit. 165.

article 'Atharvaveda Kāṇḍa XV' was a short analysis of the Vrātya book. His inferences may be best expressed in his own words : 'In Kāṇḍa XV of the Atharvaveda, the word (Vrātya) stands for the spirit of Disorder. The author here enunciates that it is a law of nature that out of Disorder evolves Law and Order and further states that although originally, there was religious Disorder everywhere, Vaidic precepts and rules were evolved out of Religious disorder according to the Inscrutable laws of nature and that these precepts, rules, Yajñas, and chants constitute true principles of Law and Order".[1] Concluding, he had added a tabular representation of (a) the regions and objects into which Disorder penetrated, (b) the names under which Order appears and (c) the forms in which Order appears, based on inferences supported by the text.

Undoubtedly Hauer's 'Der Vrātya' is up to the present, the most detailed analysis of the problem, and if it has not been convincing enough to bring to us the final solution of our riddle, it has not failed to convey the remarkable importance of the Vrātya tradition, traces of which are to be found as early as the period of the Atharvaveda and the oldest Brāhmaṇas. His former attempt at understanding the Vrātya book embodied in 'Die Anfaenge der Yogapraxis' which, as shown above, was characterized by Winternitz as 'a deliberate fight into the Land of Fantasy', was according to him 'a bold endeavour on my part to understand the book itself, without much consideration of the former hypotheses of Charpentier, which constitute important phase in solving the Vrātya problem, and that too, from view-point which dominated my research at that time and was mainly concerned with the ecstatic practices appearing in the Ṛgveda and the Atharvaveda.[2] The 'result was' as he further stated, that he understood the Vrātya of A. V. XV., as 'a type of wild Ecstatic, as the oldest figure of the Yogin that can be found in literature' and called it 'the warrior-ecstatic' so as to indicate that his home is to be found outside the Brahmanical Kulturkreis, where instead of the Brahman, the priestly warrior was the

---

1. Op. Cit. 179.
1. Op. Cit.—Vorbemerkung—12ff.

dominating holy person. He even searched for 'a close contact of the Vrātya with Sāṅkhya-Yoga and thence with Buddhism without being able to prove it in detail' (Ibid). It was, however, the detailed and pointed criticism of Winternitz, which instigated him to enter into this elaborate study which resulted in the publication of 'Der Vrātya'. In this book he viewed the problem under three headings: (1) 'the philological basis as an aid to the understanding of the original character and outfit of the Vrātyas' ; (2) 'the Vrātyas and the Mahāvrata' and (3) 'the deification of the Vrātya'. Summarily his views give us the impression that his main contributions are solely based on the understanding of the mystic aspect of the Vrātya and his magical performances. In this he abided by his former hypothesis, without emphasizing the ecstatic element which was one of his main findings formerly. Philologically, in his opinion 'vrātya' should be derived from 'vrāta'. Thus 'the oldest meaning of 'Vrāta' is a group of people bound by holy ceremonies, bound by a vow to cult-actions'[1] being derived from 'vrata' which is a vow taken in the service of a god'.[2] The Vrātīnas, on the other hand, 'were Aryans of a more primitive culture and religion, than the orthodox Brahmans' ; and 'were organized in cult-unions'[3] and both 'Vrātya' and 'Vrātīna' being derived from 'vrāta' are 'members of the same holy union'. The only difference between them apparently was that the Vrātīna went to the Brahman countries to perform the Vrātya-work and were paid for it, while the Vrātyas acted in their own homeland.[4]

The most interesting part of Hauer's thesis is probably that dealing with the deification of the Vrātya. His reading of the different texts of the Sāmaveda and the Black Yajurveda and also that of A. V. XV., convinced him that these texts had a tradition of divine beings called Vrātyas, who possessed and passed on a type of secret wisdom. A comparison of Jaiminīya I. 10; Jaiminīya Upa. Br. 1. 34 and A. V. X. 8; 35; 36 and also VIII. 6; IX. 6., led him to the conclusion that A. V. III-XIII contains the remaining portions of the Vrātya tradition (in dem Abschnitt A. V. VIII-XIII die Reste der Uederliefe-rung der Vrātya enthalten sind. 299). Further he found 'the centre of the secret tradition of the Vrātyas being theistic mysticism with the puruṣa as the central cenception'[1] The evidence of the Anukramaṇī mentioning Āṅgirasa Tiraścī as an alternative to Dyutāna Māruta, perhaps the Ṛṣi. of R. V. VIII, 96, suggested to him the possibility that the Vrātya gṛhapati Dyutāna was somehow connected with the Aṅgi rasas, (302). The addition of the old rites of power and fertility in the Vājasaneyī and the Śatapatha in the context of the ceremony for the erection of the Sadas, with which Dyutāna Māruta is connected according to some texts, proves, in his view that the Vrātyas performed the rebirth and fertility rites: 'Muessen sie vor allem die Trager dieses Wiederge-burts- und Fruchtbarkeitsritus bei den Weihen Gewesen sein', (304). Referring to the 'Ekāvrātya' he maintained that the 'Vrātya deification reached its highest point in the Ek āvrātya who must have been a figure of the earliest Vedic times, or even of a still earlier period of Vedic religion, as in A. V. XV., he is already a cosmogonic power' (306). From the Jaim. and the Jaim. Up. Brahmanas, it had seemed to him that, in the Vrātya mythology, the Ekāvrātya was the highest deity (hoechste Gottheit. p. 306) and Jaim. Up. Br. III. 21 is valuable as an original document of the lost Vrātya tradition. With him, again the Vrātya book presented an attempt made to regard the Vrātya as an original principle of all divine powers, manifesting itself as Mahādeva and roving about in the world as Ekāvrātya, and was connected with the Jaim. Up. Br., although, while in the former the Vrātya belief is placed above

---

[1] (durch heilige Zeremonien zusammengebundenen Schar der Eingeweihten......eine zu einer kultischen Handlung durch ein Gulubde verbundene Schar. 186.)

[2] (das gelubde, der Eid, den man im Dienste eines Gottes auf sich nimmt. 187.

[3] Op. cit. 203-204. (Sie waren Arier primitiverer Kultur and Religion als die des orthodoxen Brahmanismus........in kultischen Genossenschaften organisiert waren.).

[4] Op. cit. 215. (Der unterschied zwischen beiden war offenbar nur den dass sich die Vrātīna zum Vrātya-werk dingen liessen und zu diesem Zwecke......ins land der Brahmanen fuhren, wahrend die Vrātya in den heimatlichen Kwtgenossenschaften amtierten).

---

1. (Der kraftlebendige Mittelpunkt scheint aber eine theistische gerichtete Mystik gewesen zu sein mit Puruṣa als dem Zentralbegriff. 301).

the Brahmanic belief, in the latter the purpose is clear to unite the Vrātya-mysticism with Brahmanic speculation. (308-309). The identification of the Ekarṣi with the Vrātya in the Praśnopaniṣad, and that of the Ekāvrātya and the Ekarṣi in the later texts led him to suppose that the Vrātyas were priestly sages whose deification was perfected in the Ekāvrātya.[1]

His explanation of the curious absence of any reference to the 'daiva' or the heavenly Vrātyas, in the texts of the Sāmaveda schools other than that of the Tālavakāras or the Jaiminīyas, in the Brāhmaṇas of the white and the Black Yajurveda and even in the Ṛgveda, in spite of the presence of an authentic tradition of the vrātyas in Baudhāyana, who, (he thought,) could be connected with the Vrātya leader Budha, certainly deserves mention as it is a matter of remarkable importance. As far as he understood the problem, the reason seemed to lie in the fact that the two exceptional Sāmaveda schools, mentioned above, were closely connected with tbe converted Vrātyas, and therefore saw that the heavenly Vrātyas were included in the Vedic pantheon, whereas the other schools were not so related, and in the Ṛgvedic and Yajurvedic schools, the memory of the Vrātya tradition was deliberately effaced. That we should find even in the Kauṣītakī Brāhmaṇa, which, Hauer thought, probably owed its origin to the Vrātya leader Kuṣītaka, a complete lack of reference to this tradition, could only lead us to the inevitable conclusion, in his opinion, that the majority of the Vrātyas in Vedic times had still their own rites, and did not recognise the orthodox Soma-sacrifice as the central factor in the performance of rituals.[2]

Another inference of Hauer, perhaps of equal significance is that there was a proof in the Jaiminīya for considering the Vrātyas as originators of a new belief, i.e., the belief in Prajāpati, who came to be the chief deity at the end of the Ṛgvedic period and in the orthodox Brāhmaṇa texts.[3]

His rendering of the Brāhmaṇa and the Sūtra texts connected with the Vrātyastomas, forms a major part of his thesis, which we shall have occasion to refer to in the proper context. Similarly his theories regarding the connection of the Vrātyas with the Mahāvrata may be taken up in our analysis of the textual evidence.

---

[1] (auch sie sind Priesterseher gewesen, deren Vergottlichung in dem Ekavratya zur Vellendung kam. 314).

[2] Op. cit. 335.

[3] Ibid. 337.

Less detailed is N. N. Chosh's treatment of the problem in his 'Indo-Aryan Literature and Culture (origins)'. In his own words this study 'was a planned endeavour to solve the inter-twisted problems of Indo-Aryan literature and culture'. Among the enigmas that appeared totally 'untractable' to other scholars, these of the 'Vrātya-stoma' ritual-literature, the 'unrestrained glorification in the Vrātya book of the A. V., of the despised heretic and unbeliever of later days, and also the Ekavrātya of the same Veda' are of prime importance in his judgement, and hence the need was felt by him for further research. The Vrātya-stomas could be classified, according to him, thus: (1) Conversion ceremony; (2) Re-initiation of the excommunicate; (3) initiation of young persons of Aryan lineage not initiated and (4) Initiation of the old persons continuing their life in the degenerate state, the basis of the first two being political, while that of the last two, was probably secular. Further, in his judgement the Vrātya-stomas were for 'rather questionable gentry, gipsy-like vagrants or other similar non-descript banditti and very far from being blue-blooded Varangions and as such the Vrātya was Eastern and from the East, and a Non-Aryan if Aryan must mean only the Vedic Aryan, 'hailing from the west'. It was again his firm conviction, that 'the most noteworthy accession of man-power of the Vedic world came from the East, the Anūpadeśa, and 'this rolling inundation' took the 'prevailing part' in a process 'which led to the crystallisation of the combined Aryan and Non-Aryan material in the Indo-Aryan Varṇa-āśramadharma'. In the age of the Sūtras, he found the stomas had ceased to be a living practice and the motives of conversion and regeneration had completely disappeared, though in the days of the Brāhmaṇas they had not probably become obsolete. He decried the analysis of the Vrātya book by Bloomfield as 'a greater enigma than any to be met with in the book itself'. 'Śivaitic influence' used by the same scholar in the same context, was in his view exemplary of the error of "putting the cart before the horse" and Rudra a Non-Aryan deity was accepted into the Vedic pantheon from the gods worshipped in the Eastern Vrātya land. The Vrātya book, he suggested 'lays down theosophic doctrines for the benefit of the Vedic Aryans' and was not mere 'political propaganda'. Further the Upaniṣadic doctrines 'grew up in the brains of the Vrātya Rājanyas and amalgamation of Brāhmaṇa dogma and Upanisadic theosophy resulted in the birth of Neo-Aryanism and not Neo-Non-Aryanism'. He did not find the apotheosis of the Brahmacārin in this book, and it was at its best a "common-place glorification of brahmavids' in esse and in posse". He even went to the extent of saying that the Atharvan collection was "the first representative of the Literature of Synthesis and originated in the practical demand that arose in Vrātya land for a Priests' vade mecum for Aryan Brahmans officiating for pro-forma Aryanised Vrātya 'yajamānas".

The 'riddle' of the Eka-vrātya of A. V. XV., had prepared the ground for him to deviate most from previous scholars. He actually 'tried to visualise' as he himself says, the Eka-vrātya as the 'Prince of Brahma-vids' and the Emperor of a 'far larger world' than that comprised by the Aryan settlements; his 'virāj' or empire, extending to the ocean perhaps identical with that of Pṛthu Vainya of the Purāṇas which, according to the Harivaṃśa and the Vāyu Purāṇas, was the 'very earth, well-spread, well-divided, decorated full of grains. Beautified by towns and capital cities' (prathitā pravibhaktā śobhitā śasyākarāvatī sphītā cāturvarṇya-samākīrṇā purapattana-śālinī vasuṁdharā), and he himself being the same as the Pauranic pṛthu the first ruler among men, 'the Lord of the Earth consecrated by Rājasūya' (Rājasūyābhiṣiktānām ādyaṃ sa vasudhādhipaḥ')[1] He, however, indicated that the empire of the Eka-vrātya was better described in the Bhūmi-Sūkta of A. V. which is for richer in details.

Certain emendations of textual passages, were also suggested by him, the propriety or otherwise of which, we shall discuss when we review the texts. Pauranic evidence as quoted by him in support of his arguments are outside our query.

---

1. H.V. II. 24.

R. G. Ojha devoted an article[1] to the study of the position of the Vrātyas under the title 'Vrātya-stoma' with the sub-heading 'Re-admission into Hinduism of the Depressed and the Fallen classes'. Examining both the Vedic and the classical sources, he inferred that the 'correct and grammatical derivation of Vrātya lies in 'vrāta' referring to the hordes of people outside, and even hostile to the Ṛśi society or Brahmanic circle' and that 'the Vrātya-stoma sacrifice was greatly instrumental in securing the absorption of the degraded and depressed Aryan folk of nomadic habits into the settled life of the Ṛṣi society'. He had denied the Non-Aryan character of the Vrātyas on grounds of common language and the possibility of their admission into the Brahmanical society and hinted at the identity of 'vṛṣala' and 'vrātya', in later literature as far as connotation was concerned.

A more recent scholar, who has further investigated the Vrātya sources is A. P. Karmarkar, whose thesis entitled 'the Vrātya systems of Religion' has lately appeared. Prior to mentioning the views of Karmarkar, reference should be made to Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar's[2] casual remarks on the position of the Vrātyas in Ancient India, in one of his lectures on 'Aryanisation', as they prepare the way for Karmarkar's deductions. According to Bhandarkar the Vrātya of the Atharvaveda is probably connected with a 'deity of some Non-Aryan cult' viewed differently by the converted Vrātyas, since the companions and the outfit of the Vrātya mentioned therein, e.g. the puṃścalī, and the Māgadha and uṣṇīṣa, pravarta, and vipatha, are not found to be 'associated with any vedic Aryan deity'. The vrātya of the Y. V. appearing in the Puruṣamedha list seems to him to stand for the devotee and not the deity himself. Further the Vrātya-sūkta of A. V. is 'the mystic glorification of the Eka-vrātya, the original Śiva deity, 'by worshippers of this original Śiva, who, 'steeped in Aryan culture, sublimated the Vrātya cult, as Kṛṣṇa's dalliance with the Gopis is explained metaphorically by his modern worshippers'.

Bhandarkar was, perhaps, the first to associate the Vrātya cult with some 'pre-historic form of Siva', the earliest representation of whom he believed are found in the seals and terracotta figurines found among the ruins of Mohenjodaro and Harappa, and the 'Māgadha' in the entourage of the Eka-vrātya was a priest of the Magadha tribe emigrated from Śakadvīpa outside India. Thus he concluded that the Vrātyas were identical with the Magas and Magadhas of Śakadvīpa—a conjecture confirmed, in his opinion by Viṣṇu Purāṇa (11. 4. 69.-70) 'magāś ca māgadhāś caiva mānasā mandagās tathā; magā Brāhmaṇabhūyiṣṭhā māgadhāh Kṣatriyās tu te'.

---

[1] Dayananda Com. Vol.

[2] Some aspects of Ancient Indian Culture.

Carrying on further, (as already stated above), the inferences of Bhandarkar, Karmarkar[1] postulate that 'the Vrātya institution is the earliest organisation of the Proto-Indians pervading the whole of India, and to nullify it the Aryans started the parallel institution of the Cāturvarṇya and later on invented a new method of conversion by the introduction of the Vrātya-stomas (Ch.II.4)'. He is not, however, of the same opinion as Bhandarkar in maintaining that the Vrātyas were the early Magadhas of Persia, (as the 'original' Kīkaṭa-pradeśa of the Ṛgveda derived its name Magadha from that of its king Pramaganda') and makes a sweeping statement that 'the cult of the Vrātyas as a common property of all the Dravidian nations in Ancient India, and was not confined to any one tribe or locality as the Pauranic evidence indicates'. In his view, the civilization of the Vrātyas inferrable from the A.V. and the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras agrees in detail with that found in the Mohenjodaro inscriptions and representations as interpreted by Father Heras.

Critically going through this later phase of Vrātya research, we find primarily, that there is a wide departure from the earlier views. The subject is studied in greater detail, and while, on the one hand, the basic understanding of A.V. XV. is a matter of great importance to all the scholars, the significance of the Brāhmaṇa references gradually goes out of consideration. The Aryan or Non-Aryan character-controversy deepens and none of the views seems to be conclusive. Charpentier finds in them the Śiva worshippers of old, Keith and Macdonell follow the old school of Weber; Chattopadhyaya equates them with the Central Asian emigrants, Winternitz still thinks they are nomadic bands of robbers, and probably Non-Aryans Mukerji sees in them, those who have added to religious disorder, Hauer is convinced that they are members of a holy group of primitive Aryans having a well established tradition, Chanda supposes them to be ancient Sadhus, Ghosh imagines them as the finest elements of the Non-Aryan East with great imperial traditions, and Bhandarkar and Karmarkar try to confirm their non-Aryan character with evidence from the finds of Mohenjodaro. Such being the diversity, need there by any more reason to re-examine the texts dealing with the Vrātyas ?[1]

---

[1] Vrātya systems of religion.

---

[1] In a very recent issue of the M. in I. S.K. Das derives 'Vrātya' from 'vrata' in the sense of popular rite ('such as the Kumārī-vrata' of Bengal in modern times) as opposed to 'yajna' (sacrificial) rites, and concludes that the 'Vrātya's were 'un-Vedic or Non-Aryans'. For this assumption, he finds further evidence in the Non-Vedic (according to him) description of the 'Vrātya' in the Brāhmaṇas, as well as the later texts. Further, 'vrata' seems to him, to be used in the same sense in 'avrata' and 'anyavrata' in R.V. This interpretation of 'vrata' is far from being convincing, as there is no ground for thinking that it means anything more than 'observance' or 'vow' in the earlier texts. The etymological connection between 'vrata' and 'vratya', however, cannot be denied.

2. *Etymology of 'vrātya' according to ancient sources.*

Our investigation obviously begins with an attempt to find out to what extent, a purely etymological understanding of the word 'vrātya' helps us in solving this knotty problem. In this, we have to go back naturally to the Ṛgveda Saṁhitā, where, presumably, we should find its earliest occurance. Unfortunately 'vrātya' is not found in the Ṛgveda anywhere, but 'vra' 'vrata', 'vratya' and 'vrāta' do occur, any of which may from the point of view of form, be etymologically connected with 'vrātya'. 'Vratya' possibly comes closest to our 'vrātya'. It occurs once in the Ṛgveda (VIII.48.8) where it is used to designate the chanters for King Soma: 'soma rājan mṛlaya naḥ svasti tava smasi vratyās tasya viddhi' (cf. Sāyaṇa's explanation 'vratinaḥ'—'bound by vows', and Grassman:[1] 'dem Gesetz ergeben'; Ergebener,' Untergebener,' 'one attached to law', 'devoted,' 'subordinate'). Hauer's contention that 'even in the oldest Vedic literature we find 'vratya' appearing in the sense 'bound by a vow' or 'bound to some God' or 'connected with some holy work'[2] seems quite reasonable though its connection with 'vrātya' is not traced clearly by him. That 'vrata' clearly refers to some form of law and order, is conclusively proved by the epithet 'Dhṛta-vrata' (holder of the law and order) occuring at many places in the Ṛgveda, and even the extended sense of 'vow' commonly attached to it later on, is also not unknown to the compilers of the Mantras. 'Vrāta' has been taken by most scholars, as that from which 'vratya' is derived. It appears more than once in the Ṛgveda (III. 26.6., V.53.11. V.75.9., IX.14.2., X.34.12 etc.), and Sāyaṇa interprets it at all places as 'saṅgha' or 'samūha' ('host' or 'multitude'). R. V. V.53.11[3] and X.34[4] 12., are rather intersting, as the words 'Śardha' and 'gaṇa' are also used together with 'vrāta'; (a) 'Śardhaṃ' Śardhaṃ vā eṣāṃ vrātaṃ vrātaṃ, gaṇaṃ suśastibhiḥ anukrameṇa dhītibhiḥ; (b) yo vaḥ senānīḥ mahataḥ gaṇasya rājā vrātasyaprathamo babhūva, and Sāyaṇa comments on the latter that there 'is little difference between vrāta and gaṇa; vrāta is an unspecified gaṇa' (gaṇa vrātayoḥ alpabhedaḥ; avivakṣita gaṇo vrātaḥ). 'pañca-Vrāta in R.V. IX.14.2·, is, however, differently understood by Sāyaṇa as the 'five peoples' (pañca-janāḥ) 'girā yadi sabandhavaḥ pañca vrātā apasyavah pariṣkṛṇvanti dharṇasiṃ'. Grassman too understands it in the sense of 'band' deriving it from 'vra' and thinks that the 'pañca-vrātāh' referring to the five peoples is an extended use of the word (daher pañca-vrāta, die fuenf Menschengeschlechter). Bohtlingk and Roth also give to it the interpretations: 'crowds', 'guilds', fellowship', 'assemblage', 'band', 'order' (schar, Gilde, Genossenschaft, Haufe, Truppe Abteilung). It is, therefore, fairly certain that 'vrāta' in the Ṛgveda conveys the idea of 'mltitude' or 'hosts'.

---

[1] W. Z. Rv.

[2] Op. cit. 179.

[3] W.Z.Rv.

[4] Ibid.

Vrā, occuring only six times in the Ṛgveda (I.124.8; 126.5; IV.1.16; VIII.2.6.; X.123.2; and 1.121.2), seems to be of doubtful sense and has been construed by scholars differently. It is fairly reasonable that it is philologically connected wilh vrātya, but that there may be a possible connection between them as far as meaning is concerned remains conjectural. It is, tnerefore, worthwhile to re-exmine these verses and consider whether an understanding of this word renders any assistance in determining the earliest conception of vrātya'. The meaning given to it by ancient commentators as well as modren interpreters, naturally has to be fully considered in this connection. Thus to begin with, we shall consider the rendering of it Böhtlingk and Roth.

They have taken 'vrāḥ' as the plural form of the masculine word 'vra', derived from the root √ var' and conveying the sense of 'the accompanying ones, the united ones' (begleitender oder sich zusammenschliessender). The absence of the singular from 'vrah' in the Ṛgveda, has also been noticed by them and as it appears in A.V.XI.7.3., seems to be 'of doubtful meaning' and 'probably a mere play on a word that is corrupt (due to faulty redaction)', (von unbekannter Bedeutung; es scheint ein blosses Spiel mit Verstummelten worten zu sein.) Again it has been admitted by them that in R.V.IV. I.16., if jānatīḥ' is to be connected with 'vrāḥ' then the latter has to be looked upon as feminine (wenn in der Stelle R.V. IV.I.16 'jānatīḥ' zu 'vrāḥ' zu ziehen ist; were dieses als fem. anzusehen). On the basis of the Naighaṇṭuka IV.2., and Nirkuta V.3, the other Ṛgvedic references cited above, and also A.V. II.1.1., they have given the meanings mentioned above, to the word Vrā, but it is fairly clear from their attempts to explain it, that according to them the sense of 'vrā' rests on no firm basis. It is, however, true that most of the European scholars have accepted their interpretation. (Bechtel, Oldenberg., etc.). Abel Bergaigne was the first to argue against the viewpoint. Translating R.V.IV.1.16. 'te manvata prathamaṃ nāma dhenos triḥ sapta mātuḥ paramāni vindan; taj jānatīr abhyanūṣata vrā āvirbhuvad ārunīr yaśasā goḥ'; as 'they have understood the first name of the cow; they have found the three times seven supreme names of the mother; knowing that the loved ones (famale of the cows) have responded by bellowing, the red (dawn) has appeared in (amidst) the entire glory of the cow (the celestial cow);[1] in this Quarante Hymnes du Ṛgveda,[2] he felt that 'vrā' possibly conveyed the meaning of the 'celestial female' in the Ṛgveda, and added a short note on it. Here he pointed out that the sense of 'troop' is perhaps suggested ouly by its plural use as taken by Roth etc., but the singular designation 'vrāṃ' in I,121.2., parallely similar to 'menām aśvasya' and' mātaraṃ' goḥ' appears to indicate the celestial female in her incest with the father. The same is the case with R.V.X. 123.2, where again 'vrāḥ' in the plural is found as the snbject of the same verb 'abhyanūṣata', as Vena figures here, a fact which obviously brings to our mind the loved ones of Vena (Apsarasas). R.V.I.124.8., in his opinion, could easily be compared with 'samanaṃ na yoṣāḥ' (X.168.2), 'samaneva yoṣā' (VI.75.4.), 'samagruvo na samaneṣu añjan' (VII.2.5.), where the idea of

---

[1] ("Ils ont compris le premier nom de la vache. Ils ont trouve les trois fois sept noms supremes de la mere; Connaissant cela, les amantes ont repondu par un mugissement. La rouge, est apparue dans toute la gloire de la vache")

[2] M.S.L. 8.

'woman who go to be united with their husband or lover' (l'idee de femmes, qui vont s'unir a leur epoux ou a leur amant), is conveyed. Even in VIII.2.6., the comprison is according to him between those who sought to catch Indra with the cows and those who try to catch a wild animal, using the females (of those animals) for luring them. Thus he concluded that at all places 'vrā'conveyed the sense of 'the female' or 'woman' or specifically 'femme en rut' (the amorous woman) in the Ṛgveda, and I. 126.5., was no exception, as 'viśyā vrā' probably stands for the courtezans (the later veśyās), and the desire of the Pajras for glory is compared, with that, for courtezans, which is evidenced by the later comparison of fortune with the courtzean. He added, however, that there could not be any relation between 'vrā' and 'vrāta'. (le mot vra ne doit avoir aucun rapport avec le mot vrāta).

In the Vedische Studien,[1] Pischel came to the same conclusion and brought in further evidence to disprove Roth's explanation stated above. His main conclusions were the following:[1] 'abhrāteva puṃsa eti pratīcī' provides a sounder basis, for accepting the sense of Hetaira, as conveyed by 'vrā even in R.V.I.124.8., as the comparison deals with Uṣas;[2] In all passages 'vrā' is feminine; in 1.121.2., 'menāṃ aśvasya pari mātaraṃ goḥ' makes it certain that 'the wife' or the 'beloved' is meant, and in IV.1.16 and A.V.II.I.I., 'vrāḥ' should be treated as identical with 'kṣonīḥ' and 'gnāḥ'. (3) 'sura-vadhū', 'sura-sundarī' and 'surastrī' are identical with the Apsarasas and these are the divine Hetairai; similarly 'vrā' may have conveyed that which is usually meant by 'Frauenzimmer' or 'Weibsbild' or 'Weibstueck' in German; (4) the above meaning explains 'vrā' more clearly, when the additional adjective 'viśyā' is also found, as in 1.126.5., and 'viśyā vrā' is the same as the later 'veśyā'; (5) Vrā in VIII.2.6., being feminine, a fact unnoticed by Sāyaṇa, Devarājayajvan, Durgā, and most European scholars has the sense of the 'female elephant' as the animal that would be caught through (with) the aid of the females in India is the Elephant. (6) 'vrā' is similar to the later 'gaṇikā'.

---

[1] Op. cit.—Vol. II.

Bechtel,[1] objected to this interpretation and maintained that Roth's understanding was decidedly a better one. His main objections were: (1) the deciding verse VIII.2.6., interpreted according to Pischel's way of thinking involves two assumptions e.g., (a) the designation of the female animal, and (b) the Anacoluthon in the accusative from 'vrah' instead of the Instrumental 'vrābhiḥ'; (2) Pischel's interpretation of Vrā as 'female individual' in I.121.2., has not been examined and has only a formal basis. It can also be argued that 'svajā' (mas.), is used here to describe the Maruts; the buffalo in this mantra is Indra himself, and the Maruts in his retinue, being often known as forming a 'śardha', 'vrāta' and 'gaṇa' (all meaning 'hosts') may as well be called 'svajā' vrā', though one can not be definite about it due to the obscurity of the passage; (3) the comparison of 'viśya vrā' (1.126.5) with the classic 'veśyā' is open to objection as 'viś' from which 'viśyā' is derived, is in no way related in meaning with 'veśa' which is the intermediary from between 'viśyā'. 'Vrā', therefore, should be understood here in the sense of the warlike band and 'viśyā vrā' as, 'such a band connected with a 'viś',[2] and similar in meaning is 'viśo na yuktā' in VII.79.2. (vy añjate divo anteṣv aktūn; viśo na yuktā yaśasā yatante'). The translation 'the Pajras are out for gains like roving bands belonging to a 'viś' also seems to be quite satisfactory; (4) In both the verses IV.1.16., and X.123.2., which are also almost identically worded the word 'vrā' seems to indicate 'a group of male beings (eine Mehrheit maennlicher Wesen). The former is similar in content to IV.1.13.15, and also the verse that follows it, which is slightly different in form. It speaks of the myth of the liberation of the Dawn in which Indra is helped by the 'pitaraḥ', and if 'vrā' is taken to mean 'bands which come to help Indra' the meaning of the verse seems fairly clear. The latter has the same context as IX.85.10-12, the half-verse beginning with 'ṛtasya' of our verse being comparable with IX.85.11 'nāke supāraṃ upapativāṃsaṃ giro venānām akṛpanta pūrvīḥ'. The 'vipras' are mentioned in X.123.1., and X.123.4., and it is natural to conclude that by 'vrā' we should here understand the band of 'vipra's. (5) The meaning of the Pāda 'anjyankte samanagā iva vrā' in 1.124.8., is expressed by the ha f-verse of VII.70.2., (mentioned above). In the first Pāda of this half-verse vy-añjate explains specifically 'anjyankte', while in the second one 'viśo na yuktāḥ' corresponds to 'samanagā iva vrā'. Therefore, 'vrāḥ' with 'samanagā must convey the sense of 'bands going to fight' and all the more so, since 'samana' also has the sense of 'battle' (Kampf) as is clear from the phrase 'samane parṣatho narā' in X.143. 4. The similarity between VII.79.2., and 1.124.8, is so close that Roth's explanation alone seems to be the right one for 'vrā'.

---

[1] N. C.

[2] 'Scharen, die zu einer Vis gehoeren' (395)

Pischel's answer to this criticism of Bechtel is found in the concluding pages of the Vedische Studien,[1] which is perhaps the most comprehensive study of the word 'vrā' as found in the Ṛgveda and the Atharvaveda, and as such deserves a brief mention. Firstly he pointed out that the two pādas of VII. 79.2., constituting the half-verse quoted by Bechtel are connected with two separate ways of reasoning, and (as Bergaigne pointed out) embody two different ideas as in 1.92.1.,e.g., 'the women who adorn themselves' and 'the warriors who brandish their shining weapons'. These two cannot, therefore, be brought together and be considered analogous to the 'rising of the dawn'. Secondly, in each of the verses; IV.58.8., VI. 75.4., VII.2.5., X.86.10., X.168.2, merely the picture of the woman going to the 'samana' or adorning themselves for the 'samana' is presented, and it would be highly unreasonable to argue only on the basis of X.143.4., that in 1.124.8., 'samana' refers to 'war' and 'vrā' going to the 'samana' are warrior-bands. 'Samana' everywhere in the R.V. means the festival meeting or the festival, comparable to the later 'yātrā's and 'utsava's, where young and old women hoped to find husbands and courtezans flourished. There is, therfore, no reason to disapprove of the interpretation of 'samanagā vrā' as 'women who go adorned, to the festival meeting'. Thirdly the meaning of the word is quite clear in 1.121.2., though the verse is not easy to explain. Sāyaṇa's etymological attempts at understanding this significant word bear testimony to his ignorance of the traditional interpretation, and has resulted in gross misinterpretation, though, however, the historical introduction to his commentary on 1.121.2., referring to a mantra in which Indra speeks, is significant, and unless this mantra is traced nothing definite can be said regarding the interpretation of the verse. Still it is almost certain that 'vrā' here like 'menā' (mare) and 'Goḥ' (cow) should refer to a female animal. Herein we have the oft-discussed co-ordination—'after Indra had begotten a cow with the mare, he looked around for the cow' (das schon oft besprochene Verhaeltnis der Coordination vor; Nachdem Indra mit der Stute eine kuh orzeugt hatte, blickte er sich nach der kuh um), probably also found in X.111.3. Fourthly, all words for women and wife can be used for female animals, though they are used seldom, as the latter have their own names, and the use of 'vrā' in VIII.2.6., is in no way different from the usual form of address. The Anacoluthon pointed out by Bechtel, is a true Vedic way of expression, and one may even suppose that 'vrā' appearing at the end of the pāda is an abbreviated form of 'vrābhiḥ'. Even with Roth's interpretation the sense of the verse is not clear. Grassman's translation of it as 'Treiber' (game-beater) is also contradicted by the expression 'abhitsaranti dhenubhiḥ'. The same applies to Sāyaṇa's rendering 'vyādha' (hunter). 'Perhaps one hunted the elephant in groups or bands when one wanted to kill him, but when one wanted to catch him, one needed the female of this species, as has often been mentioned and proved in the writings of the Greeks'.[1] Lastly, he pointed out that 'viśya' was not brought together etymologically with 'veśyā' by him, but, on the other hand the connection was suggested on a contextual basis.

---

[1] Vol. II.

Mukerjee's suggestions may also be mentioned as they present a totally different picture.[2] In his opinion too, Sāyaṇa, being unable to interpret it, laid emphasis on its derivation and 'assumed the meaning of another word (vrata) the meaning

---

1. (Mann jagte den Elephanten viellicht truppweise wenn mann ihn totten wollte zum Fange aber wurden nur die Weibschen verwendet, was oft wewahnt wird und der Darstellung der Griechen bestatigt).
2. Vra in the Ṛgveda—See above.

of which was equally uncertain'. He, however, thought that Sāyaṇa rightly interpreted, vrā' as 'hunter' in VI II.2.6. The views of Bergaigne and Pischel, according to him, had 'no authority to support them' and Oldenberg's surmise that in IV.1.16, it refers to the 'hosts of priests' could be accetped, if only it could be proved that 'no yajnas could be performed except by a large number of persons and further that the address to Uṣas early in the morning must be recited by many persons together'. Thus he concluded that the best explanation of it was given by Yāska; 'mṛgaṃ na vrā mṛgayante mṛgamiva vrātyāh praiṣāh' (V.1.3.) which Durgā elucidates as referring to the 'hunters' (lubdhakādayah), and accepting this in all the verses 'vrā' could be better explained.

These attempts of exegetes to find out what is exactly meant by 'vrā' in the Ṛgveda and the Atharvaveda raise three important issues. Is 'vrā' masculine or feminine, or feminine at some places, and masculine elsewhere ? Further, has the interpretation 'hosts' of 'vrā' made it identical with 'vrāta' ? Finally, how far can the explanation 'woman' or 'Hetarai' or 'female elephant' be justified on contextual grounds ? To add yet another query; 'what is the interpretation of Yāska' ?

Regarding the first question, it need hardly be mentioned that undoubtedly 'vrāh' in IV.1.16, and 'vrāṃ' in 1.121.2., stand for the 'female' and in the R.V.at least there is no instance where the masculine singular from 'vrā' is found. The second question is difficult to answer, but as the meaning of 'vrāta' in the R.V. is accepted by all scholars to be 'groups' or 'hosts' the difference of context as far as 'vrā' is concerned leads us to think that the two cannot be identical. As to the question whether 'vrā' in the R.V. designates the female either of the animal or of the Demimonds, or the 'fêmme en rut' it is necessary to re-examine the verses mentioned above.

R.V.1.111.1., in which we find the first occurence of 'vrā' is difficult to explain, but the meaning of the feminine accusative 'vrāṃ' in 'anu svajām mahiṣaś cakṣata vrām' seems to be quite clear if we accept the supposition of some scholars that the mythical story of Indra's connection with Menā the daughter of Vṛṣaṇāsva, familiar to the Vedic seers is faintly echoed in the last pāda here; 'menāṃ aśvasya pari mātaraṃ goḥ'. The legend is mentioned by Sāyaṇa, commenting on the second half verse of 1.51.13: 'the Brāhmaṇa passage explaining a part of the 'subrahmaṇya' (formula) is thus quoted by the śātyāyanins: 'the Menā of Vṛṣaṇāśva'; 'Maghavan (Indra) becoming Menā (the daughter or wife) of Vṛṣaṇāśva resided in (his) house; Indra himself desired (to possess) her (Menā) who had attained youth (come of age)';[1] according to the Tāṇḍins it reads: 'there was a daughter of Vṛṣaṇāśva, Menā by name,' Indra desired (to have) her. (tathā ca tāṇḍibhir āmnātaṃ, Vṛṣaṇāśvasya nāma duhitā āsa tām indraś cakam iti). These two references agree almost verbatim with that in the Jaiminīya (11.78), and Ṣaḍviṃśa respectively as pointed out by Hanns Oertel.[2] The same story is hinted at in M.S (111.5.5.) 'indro vṛṣaṇāśvasya menā āsīt' and a parallel example is quoted in the K.S. (XI11.5) 'indro' vai vilisteṅgāṃ dānavīm akāmayata; so......stry eva strīṣv abhavat'. Again in the Śatapatha Indra is addressed as the 'wife' of Vṛṣaṇśva(111.3;4.18).,which Oertel, contrary to Eggeling's suggestion[3], rightly points out, is an allusion to the Ṛgvedic Vṛṣaṇaśva-menā legend. Thus 'menā' in our verse is the same as the daughter or wife of Vṛṣaṇaśva, and consequently 'aśva' may be identical with 'Vṛṣaṇaśva'.[4] It may be pointed out, however, that in the last pāda there seems to be a play on the words 'menā' and 'aśva' meaning both 'Vṛṣaṇaśva' and his daughter' and 'the wife of the Horse' (mare). The legend clearly shows that Indra as Bull or Buffalo, manifested himself as one belonging to the womenfolk, and 'svajā'', therefore, should be understood as 'begotten or generated by himself', and 'vrā' as one of his female forms. Geldner's inference may be correct that probably 'svajā vrā' is the some as 'menā' but that 'vrā' has the special meaning of 'the enticing woman' (Lockweibe) merely on the basis of this verse cannot be accepted. Bechtel's supposition that 'svaja vrā' here as an epithet of the Maruts, though not impossible, seems to be a bit far-fetched, as this, in that case would be the only instance where they are spoken of in this manner. It is interesting to note that Skandasvāmin, a pre-Sāyaṇa commentator on the Ṛgveda,[1] (probably deviating from the traditional interpretation), suggests as an alternative, that 'vrā' should be connected with 'menā', the phrase 'vrāṃ' meaning 'the courted woman', i.e., the 'wife', and 'aśva' and 'go' refer to 'prajāpati' the pervader) and Indra respectively. (vrāṃ varaṇīyām menām striyam; bhāryām ityarthaḥ; aśvasya śu vyāptau; vyāptuh prajāpateh;......indro' tra gaur ucyate). This interpretation, however, does not carry us any further in understanding the hymn, though it provides evidence for the fact that even among the earliest Veda commentators the association of 'vrā' with womanhood was not unknown. There is hardly any justification for Mukerjee's rendering as 'the hunter witnessing the disappearance and reappearance of light and dawn' cannot be certainly portrayed by a verse which clearly referes to Indra's glory and power. The meanings given to it by Sāyaṇa in this context, e.g., (a) the night that which envelops everytihng with darkness, or (b) the dawn that which spreads light everywhere (vṛṇoti tamasā sarvaṃ ācchādayatīti vrā rātriḥ; yadvā prakāśena vrṇotīti vrā uṣaḥ) are undoubtedly proofs of his complete ignorance of the traditional meaning, leading him to rely merely on etymology and as such are of little significance. Similarly one cannot attach any importance to those given by Mādhava[2] and Veṅkaṭa Mādhava[3] as they are almost the same as the two explanations mentioned above. The modern translators have mostly followed Sāyaṇa and thus misinterpreted the hymn.

---

[1] (tathā ca śāṭyāyanibhiḥ subrahmaṇya-mantraikadeśa-vyākhyāna-rūpaṃ brāhmanaṃ evam āmnāyate; vṛṣaṇaśva mena iti, vṛṣaṇaśvasya menā bhūtvā maghavā kula uvāseti tāṃ cāprāptayauvanāṃ svayamevendraś cakame);

[2] J.A.O.S. XXVI.

[3] S.B.E. Vol. XXVI. p. 81 note 2.

[4] cf. Geldner—Der R. V.—'asvasya' ist wohl-vṛṣaṇaśvasya (149).

With I.124.8., it is not clear from the context whether 'vrāḥ' (vyucchantī raśmibḥih sūryasy anjyaṅkte samanagā iva vrāḥ) is the plural form of the feminine 'vrā' or of the masculinc 'vra', but as we know that the mesculine form is not familiar to the Ṛgveda compilers (see above), and there is at

---

1. R. V. (Bhasya)—See under I. 121.2.
2. Ṛgveda-vyākhyā.
3. Ṛgarthadīpikā.

least one instance where the feminine singular form cannot be doubted (f. IV.1.16.), it would be fairly reasonable to take it here as feminine plural. It is impossible to understand what is meant by 'vrāh' in this verse without a definite conception of that which is implied by the adjective 'samanagā' which qualifies it. Samana as correctly pointed out by the authors of the Vedic Index[1] is a word of doubtful meaning, and in all probability is used in more than one sense. Among the verses in which 'samana' appears, there is one other instance besides the above-mentioned one, where the form 'samanagā' re-appears. Thus in VII.9.4., 'samanagā' is connected with 'jātavedas' (Agni) :'iḍenyo vo manuṣo yugeṣu samanagā aśucaj jādvedāḥ', which Sāyaṇa explains as 'accompanying (the people) in battles' (yuddheṣu saṅgatā san)' taking 'samana' as a synonym for 'saṅgrāma' (war). Hillebrandt,[2] however, translates differently; 'a visitor to their (men) assembly' — (ein Besucher ihrer Versammlungen) obviously taking 'samana' as meaning 'assembly' and especialy 'of men' as 'mānuṣo yugeṣu' appears in the first Pāda. Sāyaṇa probably bases his interpretation on the mention of 'samana' as one of the synonyms of 'saṅgrāma' in the Naighaṇṭuka, but as the conception of Jātavedas has no intermittent links with 'bands of a men going to fight', his view can hardly he accepted. That, perhaps a short of meeting may be the best explanation of the Ṛgvedic 'samana' is also deducible from two other verses in which the 'woman is actually stated to be going to the 'samana': 'saṃhotraṃ sma purā nārī samanaṃ vāva gacchati' (X.86.10) and 'saṃ prerate anu vātasya viṣṭhā ainaṃ gacchati' samanaṃ na yoṣaḥ' (X.168.2). It is true as Oldenberg[3] points out that 'anjyaṅkte' occurs in the Ṛgveda also in the context of 'men' as in VII.53·3., and VIII.29.1.[4] but that certainly does not lead us to the conclusion arrived at by him that 'Vrā' means 'probably not hands of warriors but bands: may be of men only' (An manner liesse sich nicht denken ?)

---

1. Vol. II.
2. L. der R. V.
3. R. V. Noten—Vol. I.
4. (dass 'anjyañkte' von Mannern stehen kann, wurde, bedurte es dessen bewiesen, durch VII. 53·3·, VIII.29·1·),

Moreover, he himself thinks that Pischel translates it rightly here as 'adorning women' though on other grounds the interpretation of the latter at other places seems unjustifiable. Again we find the lack of textual support for Bechtel's suggestions mentioned above. It is quite plausible to argue that the simile of the rays of the dawn with the flashing of weapons by warriors is not unknown to the Ṛgvedic seers (cf.1.92.1: niṣkṛṇvānā ȧyudhanīva dhṛṣṇavaḥ), yet it is difficult to deny the validity of the suggestion of Bergaigne and the inference of Pischel that the idea of the adorning female cannot be dissociated from 'vy añjate divo anteṣv aktūn' (cf. R. Ved. L'Aurore p.246) and hence the two pādas of this half-verse (I.92.1) must be separated if we have to appreciate the suggested sense of the verse. The conception of 'L' element femelle du ciel'[1] occurs consistently in the Hymns to Uṣas and it is unreasonable to imagine that after having thought of the simultaneous appearance of dawn with the completion of night as similar to that of the younger sister (night) departing, making place for her elder sister (dawn), the poet should at once be reminded of the similitude between the flickering brilliance of the rays of the sun and the occasional flash of the weapons of bands of warriors going out to fight. The other proposition of Oldenberg that 'samanagā iva vrā' may refer to bands of men going to a meeting place, seems to be out of place in this context, and the idea of the adorned women proceeding to a meeting place seems natural.

In I.126.5, we have the additional term 'viśyā' (subandhavo ye viśyā iva vrā), which, if is understood correctly, should lead us to a clearer conception of 'vrā' which is qualified by it. According to Bergaigne,[2] the idea of a courtezan seems easily deducible, whether we consider 'viśyā vrā' as Nominative or Accusative plural. In the former case, the sense seems to be 'the Pajaras, in their desire for glory', i.e., wealth are comparred to the courtezans, while in the latter, the comprison is between the wish of the Pajras for glory and one's desire for courtezans. This way of reasoning, however, seems to be

---

2. cf. Bergaigne—Rel. Ved. Vol. II. 241.
1. Quarante Hymns du R. V.—See above.

based on pure conjecture. According to Zimmer,[1] on the other hand, the special meaning of 'warrior bands of a village' could be easily given to 'vrā' in this context, and 'subandhavo ye viśyā ivā vra' means related bands who constitute a viś' (verwandten scharen, die eine Vis bilden). Further, in his opinion, 'vrā' refers to a group consituting a 'viś', the members of which were related to each other, as is the case with the warrior bands of a village, and the army of a tribe was first grouped into 'viś', and then into 'vraja' or 'vrā' the latter being composed of the able-bodied members of a 'kula'. He took 'anasvantaḥ' here, as qualifying 'vrāḥ', apparently thinking the latter to be masculine plural. Hillebrandt, arguing slightly differently, translated the second half-verse thus: 'The Pajras are grand companion, who go out to obtain glory like bands of a tribe, with loaded wagons'. He added that the comparison could not refer to courtezans, as the mention of 'the Pajras going out with loaded wagons reminds us of the nomadic tribes like the Bhats, Carans, Banjaras, and the connections they have with the Pajrīya sāmans confirm the supposition'.[2] Bechtel, as we have already seen above, interpreted it as 'roving bands belonging to a 'viś' and compared it with 'viśo na yuktāḥ' (VII.79.2.). Pischel translated it, in agreement with Bergaigne, as 'The Pajras as good friends, went out to win fame, with their loaded wagons, like Hetairai'[3] Celdner[4] also abided by Pischel's interpretation. Sāyaṇa's explanation does not help us much, as it is based on the supposed equation 'vrā'—'vrāta', and the inference that he draws from 'subandhavo', is far from being convincing.[5]

The Pajras, in the Ṛgveda, are certainly one of the families of priests, as Bergaigne pointed out, and Kakṣīvat, for some reason or other, which is not clear to us from the references is called 'pajrīa' (connceted with Pajra). It is also clear from the preceding verse[6] that the descendants of Kakṣīvat

---

1. Alt. Leben.
2. Lieder der R. V.
3. Op. cit.—121.
4. Der R. V.—149.
5. 'viśāṃ vrātā yathā parasparam anurāgavantas tathaite pityarthah' (as groups of 'vis's are attached to each other so also these Pajras.')
6. I 126. 4.

are called Pajras. (madacyutāḥ kṛṣṇāvato atyan kakṣīvanto ud amṛkṣanta pajrāḥ). It may be inferred, therefore, that Kakṣīvat and his descendants were closely connected with the Pajras, and kakṣīvat being the Ṛṣi of the verse, they would naturally be referred to as 'good-kinsmen' (subandhavo). Consequently for 'vrā' connected with the 'viś' here, we have to presume that the poet has a similar idea of kinship in mind. It is suggested by Kosambi that the reference here is probably to the 'nomadic common clan-wives by group-marrige, riding bullock-carts'.[1] This interpretation is not impossible though rather far-fetched. We have, therefore, to admit uncertainty as far as the meaning of 'viśyā iva vrā' is concerned.

In IV.1.16., the ephithet 'jānatīḥ', as indicated above definitely proves that, at least, in this context, 'vrāḥ' is feminine plural. Secondly, as has been already mentioned by Pischel,[2] the root 'nu' with 'abhi', from which 'abhyanū-ṣata' here is derived, is nearly always used with the feminine substantive in the Ṛgveda, excepting IX.717., and generally associated with songs, prayers, and cows. It is rather difficult to understand what is meant to be conveyed by the first name of 'dhenu' and 'the three times seven names of the mother', in this verse. Nevertheless, to suppose that the usual sense of the 'milch-cow' does not fit in with this 'dhenu', as Mukerjee has done, merely on the ground that 'vrṣabhapatnī', Viśvarūpa occur in the gavāṃ vrātaṃ' tune in which this Ṛk is to be sung, is to strain facts. Surely, these rules set down for the chantig of Ṛks, being mainly concerned with the technicalities of chant, have nothing to do with the meaning of the verses. An analysis, therefore, on this basis alone, is far from being satisfactory. Similarly Oldenberg's translation too, is not feasible, as it, as above, does not suit the context. It is clear from IV.1.15., that the reference here is to the Uśijs (vrajaṃ gomantaṃ uśijo vi vavruḥ), who, to quote Bergaigne again, are the male ancestors (pitaraḥ) appearing under the name Aṅgiras and Āṅgirasa in the myth depicting the deliverence of the cows from the cattle-shed and the liberation of the Dawn from the rock-barrier. (cf. IV.3.11.; VI;65.5.; VII.76.7.,79.4., etc.), and that the epithet 'manuṣyāḥ' applied to the ancestors in IV.1.13., suggested naturally the idea that 'here at last the sacrifice to which the mantras are related is terrestrial.'[1] If we do accept a sacrificial context for IV.1.13.20, for which there is sufficient evidence, we have to think of some possible connection between the Uśija and the 'vrā's. In that case Oldenberg's[2] interpretation e.g., 'host of Ṛṣis' could be accepted, only if it is further specified. It connot, however, be maintained that 'te' in the first half-verse refers to the celestial priests, the Uśijs, as in VII.1.13., and I.60.2.,[3] and the 'vrā' in the second half-verse designates the actual sacrificers, since 'pitarah manuṣyāḥ' in IV.1.13., clrearly goes against this assumption. Consequently, by inference, 'tat jānatīḥ' seems to indicate the continuity of the secret wisdom pertaining to the first name of the milch-cow and the three times seven names of the mother, amids the 'vrā's who obviously would be the descendants of the Uśijs. In other words the meaning of 'vrāḥ' would be the same as that of prajāḥ'. (cf. Sāyaṇa on A.V.II.1.1.7). The motive behind the naming of the descendants of Uśijs as 'vrā' in not very clear from the context but, if another title of Kakṣīvat e.g., Auśija found elsewhere in R.V., is kept in mind, their identity could be maintained with the Pajras who, as has been already indicated, are compared with 'Viśyāḥ vrāḥ'. The plurality of men (Mehrheit), suggested by Bechtel in this connection is impossible, as 'vrā' here seems to have a much more specific significance. The attribute 'svarvidaḥ' in IX.97.39., does not limit the sense of 'vrā' here as 'svarvido vrā' in A.V.II.1.1., is used in quite a different context. Again the mythical conception of the bands of 'pitaraḥ' coming to help Indra in the act of the deliverance of the cows is definitely ruled out by the significant mention of 'manuṣyāḥ'. Mukerjee's assumption that a metaphor is borrowed here from the attitude of hunters about to find their prey to 'describe the joyous shout of the Ṛṣis' before the performance of sacrifices', is rather fantastic.

---

[1] J. B. Br. R.A.S. (1951). 22.

[2] Ved. St. II. 320.

---

1. Rel. Ved. 133.
2. Vedic Hymns. Ph. II. S.B.E.
3. cf. Bergaigne—op. Cit. 58.

Regarding the meaning of 'vrā' in VII. 2. 6., we have seen above that there is very little uniformity of opinion amidst scholars. According to some this verse is the deciding one. (cf. Bechtel). The sense of the 'female bait' (des femelles pour appat) given to it by Bergaigne, involves, as has been indicated above, the Anacoluthon : 'vrāh' for 'vrābhih' and certainly neither the argument of 'free construction', which he puts forth, nor that of 'abbreviation' hinted by Pischel can account for it in a convincing manner. Roth's rendering e. g., 'bands of hunters', on the other hand, though found to be convincing enough, by Bechtel, Oldenberg, Keith and Macdonell, seems to miss the significance of the metaphor here. Now, from the context it is here clear that some sort of contempt is meant to be expressed for those who seek to win the favour of Indra in an unorthodox manner. Sāyaṇa goes to the extent of saying that 'they are not authorized to seek Indra, and try to do so only by force'. (anadhikāriṇa eva balād indrasy anveṣaṇe vartanta ityarthaḥ). Thus, if any phenomenon analogous to the attempt of those unauthorized ones to win Indra to their side in a manner which is considered to be unfair by the privileged ones is suggested in the phrase 'mṛgaṃ na vrā', one has to side with Bergaigne and Pischel as the mere fact of bands of hunters ceasing a deer can hardly be considered to be contemptuous. The Anacoluthon in that case cannot to be explained, but it may be argued that possibly 'vrā' is in the Nominative, and refers to the female species of wild animals actually finding out the males and not hunting them, and the comparison is intended only to emphasise the actual act of 'seeking' in this manner, which in itself, may not have been considered to be laudable in this way as far as the hunter was concerned. There is, however, little justification for Pischel's equation of 'mṛga' with elephant and Oldenberg is right in pointing out that the use of the female bait is not of much importance as 'the same could be said of the Gazelle, which one usually thinks of when 'mṛga' is mentioned'. (Dass dasselbe von den Gazellen gilt, andie man bei mṛga doch eher denken wird).[1] There could be yet another interpretation of 'vrā' in this verse. 'Anye' may be taken in apposition with 'vrāḥ' and the prose-order would be thus: 'asmad anye vrā gobhiḥ mṛgaṃ no ima mṛgayante; dhenubhiḥ abhitsaranti'—'the 'vrā's different from us seek him (Indra) with offerings, as (they find out) the wild animal (with the aid of the female), and entrap him with prayers'. It is needless to mention that 'abhitsaranti' can only be understood in the sense of 'entrapping'. In this verse, therefore, 'vrā' is correctly interpreted by Sāyaṇa as referring to 'anadhikāriṇaḥ, and in this sense may be compared with the unorthodox Vrātya. Could this be the reason for Yāska's peculiar explanation of the word especially in this context ?

---

[1] R. V. Noten. Vol. II. p. 75.

Lastly 'samanaṃ yonim abhyanūṣata vrāḥ' in X. 123. 2., reminds us of 'taj jānatīḥ abhyanūṣata vrā' in the verse discussed above ānd 'svarvido' bhyanūṣata vrāh' in A. V. II. 1. 1., and it seems most likely that 'vrāḥ' conveys the same sense in all these three verses. Probably A. V. II. 1. 1., has even a similar context as our verse, since Vena figures in both. It is certainly not possible to ascertain precisely the position of Vena among the Vedic gods, as the verses in which the word Vena occurs do not describe the deity in the same manner. It, is however, difficult to dispute Bergaigne's well-known equation of Vena with Soma-Gandharva, with special reference to our verse, his deduction being based on the close similarity between X. 123. 1-4 and IX. 85. 10-12. Bechtel, as has been noted above, had indicated that X. 123. 4., and IX. 85. 11., were almost identically worded. The Vena of A. V. II. 1., may also be the same deity, as the picture here presented is almost similar to that in our verse. 'Vrā', in this verse, identical with 'vipra' had previously suggested to Bergaigne[1] the idea of 'the mythical sacrificers as guardians of 'ṛta' (law)'. Later on, however, he had to change his opinion and think of the 'mistresses of Vena'. This rendering, together with that of 'divine Hetairai' proposed by Pischel is, nevertheless, not easily deducible from the context, as in all the three verse 'vrāh' remains unspecified. On the other hand, it does not seem improbable that 'vrāḥ' in A. V. II. 1. 1., R. V. X. 123. 2., 'vena' in IX. 85. 10 (divo nāke madhujihvā asascato venā duhanty ukṣāṇaṃ giriṣṭham and 'viprā' in X. 133. 1 & 4 are used in the same sense. That the word here would then refer to the descendants of the Bhārgava Ṛṣi Vena, is obvious. (cf. Sāyaṇa : 'venā etan nāmakā maharṣayaḥ'). It must, at the same time, be pointed out that 'vrā' here, as in VIII. 2. 6. cannot be translated as 'groups or hosts', since the emphasis lies on 'tribal continuity' and not on 'multitude'.

---

[1] Rel. Ved.

Yāska's comment[1] on 'mṛgaṃ na vrā mṛgayante' is interpreted by Durgā as 'those others, i. e., the hunters, the Vrātyas, who are engaged in praising you, and are directed towards you, seek for you; hence come (O Indra) towards us, for a special reason, i. e., excess of devotion'.[2] He adds that the word 'vrā', being connected here with the 'mṛga', means 'hunters' (mṛgasambandhād vrā iti Śabdena lubdhakā ucyante.) The sense of the hunter, however, is not given to 'Vrātya' even in later literature and could not possibly be thought of by Yāska in the context of 'vrā' just because 'mṛga' also appears in the text. His interpretation of 'praiṣāh as the panegyrics of Indra.[3] is more reasonable, as the Praiṣika hymns are not unknown to the Niruktakāra. Its connection with Vrātya, however, is not very clear. It is interesting to observe that 'vrā' occurs in the Nighaṇṭu in a a section which deals with words of pure Vedic origin, divided into three categories, e. g. those of (a) unknown derivation (anavagātasaṃskāra) ; (b) unknown meaning(anavagatārtha) ; and (c) having many meanings (anekārtha). It is reasonable to conclude from this that in the days of the compiler of the Nighaṇṭu, this Vedic word could not be easily derived, had no specific meaning and was used in more than one sense. Hence Yāska's rendering of it as 'vrātya', Śākapūṇi's reading of it among the names of Uṣas, can only be considered as indicative of an attempt to give a precise meaning to the word in the context of the Saṃhitās, the traditional sense of which was certain.

---

[1] 'mṛgam iva vratyah praisah' (Nir. V. 1.3.).

[2] praiṣā yuṣmatsamstava-samyuktās tvam prati prahitāḥ itare lubdhakāḥ vrātyāḥ mṛgayante mārgayante tvām, tasmād bhakty atirekāt viśeṣahetor asmān eva pratyehi evam etasmin mantre.

[3] cf. Lakṣmaṇa Svarūpa. Nigh. Nir.

It is evident, from this analysis of 'vrā', that no specific significance can be attached to the word as it appears in the Saṃhitās, and hence no clear link can be established between 'vrā' and 'vrātya', unless further evidence is forthcoming.

3. *"The Vratya book of the Atharvaveda (XV.)"*.

Coming to the Vrātya book of the Atharvaveda, one notices primarily the peculiarity of style, in which the hymns appear. The book is divided into eighteen sections (paryāyas), which resemble the Brāhmaṇas in diction. It cannot be denied that this division itself proves that chronologically the book cannot be far separated from the earliest Brāhmaṇas in time. How then, can we account for the discrepancy that arises from a conception of the Vrātya here, which is so dissimilar to that found in the Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā (XXX) and the Tāṇḍya and Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇas? Sāyaṇa did not fail to notice it and accounted for it in his own way. In his estimation this 'Kāṇda' was not "intended to be a description of all Vrātyas, but was specifically related to a single Vrātya, was well-versed, highly priveleged, meritorious, respected by all, and envied by the Brahmans devoted to rituals":—'na punar etat sarva-vrātya-paraṃ pratipādanam api tu kañcid vidvattamaṃ mahādhikāraṃ puṇyaśīlaṃ viśva-sammānyaṃ karmaparair brāhmaṇair vidviṣṭaṃ vrātyam anulakṣya vacanam iti mantavyaṃ'. In other words, Sāyaṇa implies that the Vrātya mentioned here is different from the other Vrātyas, inasmuch as he is converted through the Vrātya-stoma, though the absence of his commentary on this Kāṇḍa makes it impossible for us to be certain about his view-point. Scholars of the west have mostly adhered to this view, with the exception of Roth, Charpentier and Hauer, as noted above. Those who are reminded of the converted Vrātya in this context, however, fail to explain the total omission of references to the Vrātyastomas, prior to the period of the Brāhmaṇas. Even if we accept the possibility of the Vrātya-stoma conversion coming into being long before it was recorded, the questions remain to be answered: 'why in the Atharvaveda, alone, among the earliest Vedic sources, is the Vrātya glorified and deified'? Roth's idea of the wandering mendicant does not fit in with the mention of the 'puṃścalī' and the 'māgadha'. Charpentier's impression that they were the ancestors of the Śaiva ascetics, does not take into account all the details mentioned in this book, characterising the Vrātya. Hauer's later proposition that 'A.V. XV., is a valuable remnant of that vast literature of the Vrātyas, which is almost lost, and glorifies the Eternal Vrātya, who appears in the forms of Rudra-Iśāna-Mahādeva and Eka-vrātya, the enternal prototype of the earthly Vrātya' is of course a reasonable one, but when he says that 'the firist Sūkta of this Kāṇḍa, the latest portion of the Vrātya book, represents the firm stand of the 'converted' Vrātyas against those who had revolted against their ancestral deities', he evidently contradicts his own former statements.[1] That A.V .XV., is a fragment of the traditional literary output of the Vrātyas is also hinted at, in the version of the Anukramaṇī: 'adhyātmakaṃ mantrokta-devatyā uta vrātya-daivataṃ' emphasising the mystic aspect of the deified Vrātya. The simple reason that this deification is mentioned only in the Atharvaveda and some of the Atharvan Upaniṣads (Praśna and Śvetāśvatara), is the fact that these presumably belonged to the Vrātyas,[2] and hence in their own text alone their ancient tradition was preserved. It is quite possible that other portions of this tradition are also present in the extent Atharvaveda (cf. Hauer's refs. to X.8.43; IX.6 etc.),[3] but as the word 'Vrātya' is not to be met with elsewhere in the A.V., we are not in a position to build up 'this glorious Vrātya tradition' on the basis of these passages of questionable authenticity.

A.V.XV., is undoubtedly a highly mystical description of the Vrātya, and almost unintelligible at places, yet one cannot overlook certain charcteristic phenomena mentioned therein which throw considerable light on the Vrātya problem as a whole. Even to the cursory reader, it is clear at the first instance, that there is nothing in this book which can in any way be characterized as non-Aryan, or contrary to the Aryan ideals and practices. It is true that Prajāpati the 'due Supreme of the Brāhmaṇas is here subordinated the Vrātya of 'primeval' Vrātya (Adi-vrātya), but it is needless to argue as Hauer has done, that'it could be inferred from this that the Supreme deity of the Brāhmaṇas-Prajapati and the primeval deity of the

---

[1] Ojha Com. Vol. 13 (Trans. mine.)

[2] 'Early History of the Gotras'—Op. cit. 90.

[3] Op. cit. 19.

Vrātyas were vying with each other to attain pre-eminence (Ibid). It is obvious that the main purpose of the redactor is to present the Vrātya as identical to Prajāpati, and not superior to him, though with a view to glorify the Vrātya he is mentioned as one 'who inspired Prajāpati' (sa prajāpatṃ samairayat). Secondly it is almost an inevitable inference from the mention here of the forms of Rudra-Śiva, manifest in the archers, 'Śarva', 'Bhava', 'Paśupati', 'Ugra' 'Rudra,' 'Mahādeva', 'Īśāna', that a full-fledged from of Śiva, worship was familier to the Vrātyas. This instance does not alter our position, in any way as the usual theory of the Non-Aryan character of Rudra in the original stages, is proved to be unsound as early as the period of the Yajurveda, where in the 'Śata-rudrīya', he is already brought into the Aryan fold. Thus the Aryan character of the Vrātya in the Atharvaveda cannot be questioned. His Non-Brahmanical nature is, however, clearly indicated in this book. It must be borne in mind that in calling the Vrātya, 'Non-Brahmnical' by nature, we are only referring to those charactersistics of his, which make him a follower of some form of Dharma, which is specifically different from the orthodox Brahmana Dharma. Primarily the retinue of the Vrātya, comprising here, the 'puṃścali', (Hetaira), the 'māgadha', pariṣkanda', (attendant), 'vipatha-vāha' (chariot horses), 'vipatha, (chariot)' with the 'sārathi' (charioteer) and the 'puraḥsara' (fore-runner), cannot by any stretch of imagination be associated with theBrahman; secondly the peculiar outfit, consisting of the 'pravartau' (two round ornaments), the 'maṇi' (jewel), the 'uṣṇīṣa' (turban) can hardly be considered to be fit for a Brahman. Lastly the 'āsandī' is usually meant for a Rājanya and not a Brahman, as is clearly seen from the Rājasūya description in the Brāhmṇa texts. It is rather difficult to agree with Hauer in thinking that the peregrinations mentioned here can be connected with the Mahāvrata. At the utmost, it can be maintained that the ritual which may have been at the back of the redactor's mind of this book, has a close parallel in the orthodox Rājasūya The setting out of the Vrātya to all directions, can only remind us of the 'symbolic conquest in all directions' mentioned in the context of the Rājasūya. Similar is the case with the receptions of the Vrātya as an honoured guest, referred to towards the end of this book, who is none other than the king or warrior-noble as guest. These characteristics of the Atharvan Vrātya, link up his followers, the earthly Vrātyas with the original Rājanyas, who remained independent and had a glorious tradition, and were disliked by the Brahmans, the pre-eminence of whom, in those days was an established fact.

It is rather strange that verses 10-13 of this book are almost verbally similar to passages 12-17 in the second book of the Āpastambīya Dharma Sūtra. It has been noticed by writers on the subject, and the usual interpretation given to the 'Vrātya' mentioned in the Dharma Sutra is that of the religious student (śrotriya), who has learnt one recension of the Veda, and is faithful fulfiller of his vows'.[1] This rendering, however based wholly on the explanation of the commentator Haradatta, e.g., 'vrātya an honorific, same as 'vrātya' meaning one efficient in the fulfilment of vows' (vrate sādhuḥ vrātyah, sa eva vrātya iti pujābhidhānaṃ), though appropriate to some extent in the context of the Dharma Sutra cannot possibly fit in with the Atharvan verses mentioned above, as there is nothing in the fifteenth book, to prove that the 'vrātya' 'who knows thus' (ya evaṃ vidvān) is a Śrotriya· It is fairly clear that this Vrātya is in fact the sole representative of the Divine Vrātya on earth. One may even maintain that in the Āpastambīya too, the honorific designates an ordinary guest, unspecified by the Sutrakāra, and as such corresponds to a common form of address as 'O traveller'. This could be accapted if the express mention of 'brāhmaṇaṃ' in II.3.7.15, and 'iti vijñayate' in II.3.7.16, was of no significance. These two expressions undoubtedly imply that these sentences mentioning the 'vrātya' are direct quotations from a Brāhmaṇa text, and Āpastamba surely means to use the term in a sense which must be closely similar to that in which it has been used in this Brāhmaṇa. The question naturally arises : 'which Brāhmaṇa is Āpastamba referring to?' Haradatta replies: 'tad idam sarvaṃ ātharvaṇe paṭhitaṁ pratyetavyaṃ', implying thereby an Atharvan Brāhmaṇa or as Buehler takes it,

---

[1] cf. Whitney A.V., Buehler S.B.E. II (Introduction).

'a Brāhmaṇa of the Atharvaveda'. This Brāhmaṇa text is totally lost to us today. Buehler says in the introductory chapter to his translation of the Ap.Dh.S., that, 'by the expression Brāhmaṇa, the Brāhmaṇa-like fifteenth book of the A·V., is meant and Haradatta also 'expresses the same opinion'. The Brāhmaṇa-like character and content of A.V. XV., has already been seen above, and 'ātharvaṇe' of Haradatta may plausibly refer to this book of A.V., but if Āpastamba really had in his mind the A.V. Saṃhitā, it seems most unlikely that he would effer to it as a Brāhmaṇa, when we do not find any traditional division of A.V., into its Mantra and Brāhmaṇa portions. Would it not be, therefore, more reasonable to think that this portion of A.V.XV., at least existed in the days of Āpastamba, is occuring in a Brāhmaṇa text quite apart from the extent A.V. Saṃhitā ? 'Vrātya' may have been used in that Brāhmaṇa in, some special sense, which obviously could be applied to it, wherever it occured in this text specially dedicated to the Vrātyas. In that case, it is not difficult to assume that at one time, all these vrātya descriptions were found together, possibly in the form of a separate Brāhmaṇa which was closly connected with the Vrātyas. In other words the existence of a distinct Brāhmaṇa named Vrātya-brāhmaṇa' cannot be totally denied.[1] The only difficulty in accepting this hypothesis, lies in finding out the specific ritual or rituals, which the Vrātya book of the Atharvaveda, especially in this section, might be taken to explain in the usual style of the Brāhmaṇas, since the unorthodox nature of this book as a whole presumes a context totally different from that of the Āpastambīya. This can only be explained if we can conceive of this book as a whole, being incorporated into the A.V. Saṃhitā from a separate Brāhmaṇa dealing with various rituals peculiar to the Vrātyas. It may even be argued that A.V.XV., originally a Brāhmaṇa portion may have some distant connection with some of the orthodox rituals, which may have been borrowed from the ritualistic tradition of the Vrātyas. In this connection, the highly mystical nature of the hymns of this book makes it impossible for us to find any positive clues. Hauer contention that the 'theistic mysticism of theVrātyas rewarded in this book, is similar to the Indra-mysticism connected with the Mahāvrata ceremony' and that the journey of the Vrātya into regions in all quarters is comparable with the perambulations round the Mārjālīya fire in the Mahāvrata, is based on flimsy evidence, and uosupported by facts. It is absurd to think, that the conceptual peregrinations of the Vrātya in several directions is similar to the dancing of the maidens with pitchers on their heads round the Mārjālīya fire. Moreover the 'mystic conception of Indra as the Omnipresent puruṣa, who united himself with his singers has little connection with the Mahāvrata' which primarily is a 'Sonnwenderfest' emphasizing the equation of Indra with the Sun.

---

[1] cf. Charpentier—W.Z.K.M. Vol. 25.

One might, however, with a reasonable amount of conjecture, find scanty evidence here for a remote connection with the orthodox Rājasūya, as noticed above. The Rājanya-like character of the divine Vrātya as well as his earthly prototypes presupposes that the supposed ritual or rituals should be meant specially for the Rājanya sacrificer. Now, the Rājasūya, according to the Brāhmaṇas and the Sūtras, is to be performed only by the Rājanya or Kṣatra, and not by the Brahman, who is given the option of performing the Vājapeya. Secondly the mention of the sāmans in the context of the 'Abhiṣecanīya' (sprinkling ceremony in the Rājasūya) while the king is made to ascend the regions, and the bringing forth of the throne-seat (asāndī) made of 'Khadirā'[1], clinch the suggested connection still further. Again the supreme position of the Vrātya among the immortals as well as the mortal beings, reminds us of the Absolute sovereignty of the consecrated monarch (Rājasūyābhiṣikta) and the Atharvan Eka-Vrātya seems more akin to the Eka-rāṭ of the Brāhmṇas, than to the Ekarṣi of the Upniṣads as suggested by Hauer.[2]

Even accepting this conjectural application of A.V.XI., to the Rājasūya we are still faced with the difficulty of connecting all the paryāyas of this book with this ritual alone. Hauer is certainly justified in making three distinct divisions under which these paryāyas are to be placed, as all of them are by no means related to any common context. Thus we have to assume that the book is very likely a collection of fragments from here and there, of a Brāhmaṇa-like text, and only some portions of it are connected with a primitive forms of the later Rājasūya.

---

[1] cf. Sat. V. 4. 1; V. 4.6.

[2] Op. Cit. 306-315.

A few words must be said regarding the position of the 'Puṃscalī' and the 'Māgadha' appearing as the companions of the Eka-vrātya. It is not easy to ascertain the meaning of these two words in the Saṃhitās, as they occur very rarely in the early texts. They do not appear in the Ṛgveda. In the Vājasaneyī only in the context of the Puruṣamedha they are used together, twice. In the Atharvaveda they are to be met with exclusively in the above context. In the Kāṭhaka and the Maitrāyaṇī they are mentioned only in the description of the Mahāvrata. From these references the only conclusion that can be drawn is that there was some similarity between the individual statuses of the 'pumścalī' and the 'māgadha', which was probably the reason for their being linked together. It is interesting to note that in the second instance in the Vājasaneyī (XXX.22) both the Māgadha and the Puṃścalī, together with the 'kitava' (gambler), and the 'klība' (eunuch) are expressly stated to be 'non-Śūdras and non-Brahmans and dedicated to Prajāpati' (māgadhah puṃścalī kitavaḥ klībo śūdra brāhmaṇas te prājāpatyāḥ' which naturally implies that they were connected with the Rājanya and the Viś A.V.XV., too, we have seen, presents the Vrātya in close connection with the Rājanya and the Viś.[1] Thus the companionship of the Vrātya with the Māgadha and Puṃścalī seems fairly intelligible. As far as the latter is concerned, there can hardly be any objection to find in it the designation for the Hetaira on the basis of etymology. It must, however, be stated that in spite of the various references even in the Ṛgveda to the general laxity of morals among the common folk in those days, there is no conclusive evidence for maintaining that the 'puṃścalī' was used in the early days in its later depraved sense. The very mention of the Puṃścalī accompanying the Vrātya, in his sojourn proves that she played an important part among those who constituted the royal entourage.

---

[1] 'so' rajyata tato rājanyo' jāyata, sa viśaḥ sabandhūn annam annādyam abhy udatisthat—8.1.2.).

Opinions differ, however, with reference to the interpretation of 'Māgadha'. Even to Mahīdhara, the commentator of the white Yajurveda, it appears that the Māgadha may refer either to the 'person born in the Magadha country', or the 'offspring of the union between a Kṣatriya women and a Vaiśya' (magadha-deśajaṃ kṣatriyāyāṃ vaisyapuṃsojātaṃ vā). Most scholars consider the second interpretation to be a later one, and find a justification for the first, in the well-known contempt expressed for the Gandharis, the Mūjavants, the Aṅgas and the Māgadhas in A.V.V.22.14, where fever is 'bequeathed to them as one leaves money with one who is sent abroad' (gāndhāribhyo mūjavadbho 'ṅgebhyo magadhebhyah praiṣyaṃ janaṃ iva śevadhiṃ takmānaṃ paridadmasi). It is quite logical to equate these 'māgadha's with the Atharvan 'Māgadha' both standing for the 'citizen of Magadha' (magadhajana), but that is not of much significance as there is hardly any reason to believe that a similar contempt for the Māgadha is also expressed in the Vrātya context. The association of the Puṃścalī, alone, does not presuppose that the redactor intended to emphasize the degraded position of one coming from Magadha as all the presonifications of the Puṃścalī in various directions, e.g., 'śraddhā' (devotion) 'Uṣaḥ' (dawn), 'Iṛā' (cheer), 'vidyut' (lightning), compared with those of the Māgadha, e.g., 'Mitra,' 'mantra' (verse), 'hāsa' (laughter), 'stanayitnu' (thunder), clearly indicate that a close affinity between the two is the main point of emphasis. The authors of the Vedic Index,[1] rightly maintain, that the later conception of the Māgadha as a 'minstrel' is a natural derivation from the original sense of a 'native of Magadha' as Magadha was probably the land of 'minstrelsy', but there is no evidence in the early texts to show that it was limited only to a Magadhadeśīya, and the idea of the 'minstrel' was unknown to the compilers. It is also impossible to state definitely the period in which this transition in meaning took place. Further the statement of the Sūtrakāras do not confirm this conjecture, as they clearly mention 'Magadhadeśīya' and not 'magadha-deśīya' the significance of which we shall indicate when we refer to the Sūtra evidence. Thus accepting the usual sense of the 'minstrel', 'bard' or 'singer' even in our context the connection with the Puṃścalī is simple and similar to that between the later 'gāyana' and 'gaṇikā'. That, even in those days, both the Māgadha and the Puṃścalī accompanied the Rājanya chief, who is the Supreme Vrātya here, does not seem unbelievable. Further, no justification can be found for Ghosh's inference that 'these descriptions prove that the Great Vratya's seat was unequivocally fixed in Magadha', though the Māgadha may have originally come from Magadha. Nor can one agree with Bloomfield in construing the Māgadha as the 'outcaste associate' of the Vrātya, and on that basis find the picture of the converted Vrātya here. It is impossible that the Puṃścalī and the Māgadha, however much their status is changed, should be deemed companions of the 'converted Vrātya' who undoubtedly becomes a Brahman through conversion.

---

[1] Vol. II.

It must also be pointed out that additional evidence that Hauer finds in the ritualistic reference to the Magadha and Puṃścalī (or Puṃścalu) in some Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras, for the connection of A.V.XV. with the Mahāvrata rite is without any basis. The Jaiminīya depicting the Mahāvrata certainly refers to the union of the Māgadha and Puṃścalī at the southern end of the altar, as a part of the ceremony (māgadhaṃ ca puṃścalum ca dakṣiṇe vedyante mithunī-kārayanti, mithunatvāya), but the context is totally different in the A.V. The presence of these two in the royal retinue of the Ekavrātya, is not the same as their ritualistic union, which probably is a foreign element borrowed from the fertility rites of the old days. Furthermore in other texts, also dealing with the Mahāvrata, such as Kāty. Śr.S., Śāṅkh.Śr.S., Pañcaviṃśa, etc., the Māgadha is not mentioned, and the puṃścalī is stated to be arguing or conversing with the Brahmacārin (brahmacāri-puṃścalyos sampravāda), which leads us to presume that not much importance was attached to this part of the ritual in later times.

Lastly Paryāyas XIV.-XVIII, are highly mystical, and almost unintelligible, in spite of the attempts of Hauer and Mukerjee, to find out their true implication. It is of course wrong to maintain with Ghosh that 'these tail off into downright incantation and nonsensicality'. One cannot deny that in content, they embody the philosophical speculations apparently of the Vrātyas, closely similar to those present in the Upaniṣads, and appearing in an allegorical form, cannot be interpreted without a proper understanding of their inner sequence in a certain specified context. Can it be supposed that these are collated from the Upaniṣad portion added to their Brāhmaṇa (the Vrātya Brāhmaṇa), similar to the Bṛhadāraṇyaka forming a part of the Śatapatha ?

To sum up, therefore, our findings in A.V.XV., we may state that being composed entirely in the prose of the Brāhmaṇas, with what Whitney calls 'casual lapse into metre',[1] it gives us the impression that originally it may have existed in fragments in some Brāhmaṇa text, for which we have the testimony of Āpastamba. and which may have been known as the Vrātya-brāhmaṇa being specially connected with the Vrātya. The theme is evidently the glorification of the Ekāvratya, the Highest Vrātya, who is identified with Rudra-Mahādeva-Īśāna, and brought into close connection with the earthly Vrātyas, who seem to have been similar to the Rājanyas by their peculiar outfit and host of companions. The ritual with which these Brāhmaṇa-like passages were linked up, was probably an older from of the later Rājasūya, the ceremony of royal consecration. The Ekavrātya and the earthly 'knowing' (ya evaṃ vidvān) vrātya are certainly the precursors of the 'daivā vratyā' and 'vrātya' respectively of the Brāhmaṇas and the Sūtras, but it is not possible to find a picture of the converted Vrātya in this book. It represents an independent tradition of certain tribes who may have had some affinity with the Bhṛgv-angirasas. They were formerly Rājanyas with esoteric beliefs, and ritual practices, which were recorded in a Brāhmaṇa completely lost to us. Later they were converted into Brahmans though the Vrātya-stomas.

---

[1] A. V.—Introduction—Book XV.

4. *References to the Vratyas outside the Atharvaveda.*

The earliest reference to the Vrātya, in texts apart from the Atharvaveda, is in the Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā. In the context of the Puruṣamedha (human sacrifice), in XXX. S., it is laid down that the 'vrātya' is to be consecrated by the sacrificer for the Gandharvas and Apsarasas; 'gandharvāpsarobhyo vrātyam'. Mahīdhara explains 'vrātya' as 'one excluded from initiation with the Sāvitrī' (sāvitrīpatitaṃ), obviousty following the later tradition,[1] and hence, cannot be accepted to have rightly interpreted it here. This incidental reference to the Vrātya amidst the hosts of victims to be sacrificed in the Puruṣamedha, does not in any way throw light on our problem. Being considered, however, as a victim it seems fairly clear that it stands for the Vrātya who has not been converted, and this may have been the reason for the above mentioned interpretation of Mahīdhara, which, as we know, is the designation for the later un-converted Vrātya. Hauer,[2] tries to find a certain relation between the Vrātya, and the Gandharvas and the Apsarasas to whom he is dedicated. Accepting the demonaic character of these two groups of deities, he argues that their capacity for 'driving one mad' best expressed in the term 'gandharvagṛhīta' (literally 'caught by the Gandharva'—obsessed), leads us to conclude that the Vrātya was one obsessed, and thus connected with wild ecstatic experiences. This argument, however, does not seem convincing, as the Gandharvas and the Apsarasas, do not appear in the Saṃhitās, merely as causing obsession among mortals, and there is no mention of the obsessed' one in R.V.X.136.6.,[3] 'the kesi walking on the path of the Gandharvas and the Apsarasas, and the wild animals, the knower, the friend of the knowable, the agreeable one, the exhilerating one'. Hauer thinks 'keśi' (the long-haired one), occuring here, stands for the Vrātya. Even if 'keśin' were taken to mean 'the long-haired attendant of Rudra' in this context, which is doubtful[1] there is positively no reference in the related texts to the long hair of the Vrātya. The Vrātya, surely, is not the attendant of Rudra, as in the Atharvaveda, itself, he is mentioned as identical with him (sa īśāno' bhavat). It seems that Hauer is too eager to find additional evidence for establishing the identity of the primitive Yogin, with the Vrātya also in the non-Atharvan texts, and consequently his interpretation is rather adventurous. Equally uoconvincing is his statement that the mention of 'durmada' (the fierce one) before the 'Vrātya' and 'unmatta' (the intoxicated one) after it, provides contextually a sounder basis for his rendering, as it is almost impossible to imagine, that the Puruṣamedha list is a really systematic one. Moreover, nothing is associated with the Vrātya, either in the earlier evidence of the A.V., or in the later testimony of the Brāhmaṇas and the Sūtras, which would in any manner characterize him as being violent in his behaviour, or showing signs of intoxication. The connection, therefore, of the Gandharvas and Apsarasas with the Vrātya, which perhaps needed to be emphasized in this list, should be traced in some other sphere. We know for certain that 'the Gandharva par excellence' has been deified in the Ṛgveda, and the Gandharvas were related to him in the same manner in which the Rudras or Maruts were to Rudra, as was rightly pointed out by Bergaigne.[2] These mythical beings have the same characteristics as the divine Gandharva, who is a celestial being, protecting Soma, regulating the course of the Sun's horses, bringing into being the first pair of human beings, Yama and Yamī, wielding a certain mystical power over women, and possessing a right to own them. He is also supposed to be a good physician. The Apsarasas, on the other hand, are not only the loved ones of the Gandhdrvas, but also together with the latter, are supposed in the Atharvaveda to be evil beings like the Rākṣasas, Piśācas Kimidins, etc., from whom protection is sought. Both of these are also considered

---

[1] cf. Manu. II. 39.40; Ya. I.37; etc.

[2] Op. cit.

[3] 'apsarasāṃ gandharvāṇāṃ ṃrgāṇam çarane caran; keśī ketasya vīdvān sakhā svādur madintamaḥ'.

---

1. cf. Sayana : 'keśī agnir vāyuh sūryo vā' and also 'keśīdaṃ jyotir ucyate' on R. V. X. 136. 1.
1. Rel. Ved.—III. 64.

to be 'divine libertines'.[1] The Gandharvas are especially ill-disposed towards women. In the Vājasaneyī, though they are mentioned as 'physicians' and 'the heavenly guardians of divine truths' in some places, yet in this context, the conception hinted at in A.V., seems to be at the back of the redactor's mind. In other words, among the deified beings, they are looked upon as the degenerate and corrupt ones. Accepting the essentially licentious character of these, can we in any way link up the Vrātya with them ? There is only one piece of evidence for this, and that is in the verdict of the Brāhmaṇas : 'na hi brahmacaryaṃ caranti', which we shall analyse presently. This relationship brings the Vrātya of the Vājasaneyī closer to the non-converted Vrātyas of the Brāhmaṇa texts. It must, however, be noted that the mention of the 'puṃścalu' and the 'māgadha' also among the Puruṣamedha victims, as noticed above, does not establish any close link of this 'vrātya' with the deified Vrātya in whose company the latter is mentioned in A.V., though the fact that he is specially dedicated to the Gandharvas and the Apsarasas, reminds one of the Atharvan tradition.[2]

Now to pass on to the Brāhmaṇas, where for the first time, the special sacrifices known as the Vrātya-stomas, come to be recorded, we must bear in mind that the casual remarks found in these texts regarding the character and outfit of the Vrātyas in general, do not form a part of the original Vrātya tradition, which is only represented by the Vrātya book and the Atharvan Upaniṣads, and possibly the Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, which certainly belongs to a period much later than that of the main Brāhmaṇas.

Among the Brāhmaṇas, only the Tāṇḍya and the Jaiminīya deal with the Vrātya-stomas. The Tāṇḍya furnishes a more detailed analysis than the Jaiminīya. Both these Brāhmaṇas belonging to the Sāmaveda, deal with these sacrifices in an almost similar manner, but the latter, while rferring to many Vrātya-stomas 'athaite vrātyastomā' (now these Vratya-stomas) in II.222, explains only one of them 'taṃ āharams tenāyajanta—' (that they brought, with that they sacrifice') which were to be performed by the Vrātyas in general. The question, as to which of these two texts, represents the older tradition is not easy to answer. Still, as Hauer,[1] correctly infers that the description in the Jaiminīya being slightly different from those found in the same context in the other Brāhmaṇa, probably records a distinct tradition, which comes closer to that recorded in the Vrātya book, due to the mention of Īśāna and Prajāpti as Vrātya deities, and as such may be considered an earlier one. It is, therefore, appropriate to take up the Jaiminīya passage first for examination.

---

[1] cf. Bloomfield ; H. A. V.

[2] See above.

Caland translates the opening sentence of J.B.II.222 (divyā vai vrātyā vrātyām adhāvayan budhena sthapatinā) as 'the heavenly Vrātyas led a Vrātya life with Budha as their chief' (Die goettlichen Vrātyas fuehrten ein Vrleben mit Budha als ihrem Oberhaupt), while Hauer renders it as 'the divine Vr. were once on their Vrātya wanderings, under Budha their chilef' (Die gottlichen Vr. waren einst auf Vr-wanderschaft unter Budha als ihrem Operhaput). 'Sthapati' undoubtedly stands for 'chief', but probably refers in particular to 'the chief secrificer' as is made clear by Baudhāyana when he says 'sa eṣām vratani carati' (he fulfils the vows of these) or 'etena kuru-brāhmaṇānāṃ putrā ījire' (with him the sons of the Kuru Braḥmans performed their sacrifice). It is easily noticeable that 'vrātyānām pravāse' of Āpastamba,[2] 'vrātyāṃ caranti' of Baudhāyana[3] and also 'vrātyāṃ pravasanti' of the Tāṇḍya,[4] have the same implication as the above phrase in the Jaiminīya, as has also been indicated both by Caland and Hauer. Baudhāyana's 'vrātyāṃ caranti' and 'vratāni' carati[5] leads us to presume that 'vrātyāṃ dhāvayan' conveys more specifically the sense of the 'performance of the 'vrātya' ceremonies. Caland's rendering 'vrātya-life' is, however, preferable to Hauer's interpretation, as 'vrātyā' could best be translated as

---

1. Op. cit. 117 ff.
1. Ap. S. S.—XXII. 5. 4.
2. B. S. S. XVIII. 25
3. XVII. 1. 2.
4. 'carati' in the sense of 'performing' is usual.

'the Vratya way of life'. What 'pravasanti' implies will be clear when we review the later passages in the Tāṇḍya and Ap.S.S.

Next, Caland's emendation of 'eka-vrātyām' as found in the Jaiminīya manuscript with him, into 'ete-vrātyā' in the next sentence, is denied by Hauer,[1] who thinks the former is the correct form conveying the idea of the dignified position of the Eka-vrātya mentioned in A.V.XV. (Ibid.56). This argument of Hauer seems to be based on pure surmise, as the reason suggested by him for the Eka-vrātya feeling offended is not supported by textual evidence. It is impossible to imagine that formerly the heavenly Vrātyas recognized the Eka-vrātya as their chief, and then aspired to deprive him of his dignified status, since he is presented in A.V. as the 'eternal Vrātya', and not as any individual in particular. It cannot be denied that this passage in the Jaiminīya points out how the divine Vrātyas came to recognize the superiority of Prajāpati, the 'centre-god' (acc. to Hauer) of the Brāhmaṇas, over Īśāna and possibly Vāyu, to whom they were devoted formerly. Still, to consider the event as representative of schisms in the religio-historic sphere in Ancient India, as Hauer does, is to strain facts. It is apparent from the form in which this mythical description (of the heavenly Vrātyas offending one of their deities, due to some error in sacrifice), appears in both the Brāhmaṇas, that it is a traditional version of the origin of sacrifices. The ritual-experts who recorded it were Brāhmaṇas not inclined towards the Vrātyas in any way, and had to convince the performers of the Vrātya-stomas, of the excellence of Brahman rituals and the greatness of Prajāpati. It need, therefore, have no historic basis, and points out only the ingenuity of the Brāhmaṇa-kāras, in creating myths to explain the validity of such injunctions. Thus eka-vrātyām is not acceptable in this context, and 'ete vrātyā' is certainly a better reading.

Describing the earthly Vrātyas, the Jaiminīya says that 'those who lead the Vrātya way of life, are as if deluded' (muhyantīva vā ete ye vrātyāṃ dhāvayanti) which implies that according to the followers of the Jaiminīya school, the ceremonies of the Vrātyas are wholly erroneous. The error probably lies in their speech as they are further stated to 'be excluded or separated from speech, and speak that which is against religious observances, and ritual practices'—vāco vā ete vyṛdhante, ye vrātyāṃ dhāvayanti; vācā hy avrataṃ amedhyaṃ vadanti). This is remedied, according to the text, by the use of the 32 'pavamāna' stotras, having the introductory verse in Anuṣṭubh (tad yad dvātriṃśaḥ pavamānā bhavanti, vācaitat samṛdhyante; anuṣṭup pratipad bhavati; ...tad yad anuṣṭup pratipad bhavati; abhipūrvam eva tad vācā samṛdhyante). By speech here, probably the ritual formulae, which were composed in verse, and presumably sung by the Vrātyas, during their ritual performances, is meant. The equation of Vāk (speech) with 'Anuṣṭup' is, as Hauer has stated, very common in Vedic tradition and the identity of speech with sacrifice also is not infrequent in the Brāhmaṇas.[1] Form this statement it is clear that the Brāhmaṇakāra is mainly concerned with pointing out certain defects in the performance of the Vrātya rites. It may even he inferred that the Jaiminīya, hints at somethings which in the Vrātya rituals is strikingly anti-Brahmanical. Further, it is laid down that such Vrātyas, so to say 'die as a result of these operations, or speak like (through the mouth of) one very old' (mriyanta iva vā ete ye vrātyāṃ dhāvayanti, uta hi sthaviratarasy āsyaṃ vadanti). This refers again to the inefficacy of their ritual practices, through which they are unable to attain the goal, i. e., heaven (svarga), and are almost dead, or lose their power of speech. 'Sthaviratarasy āsyena' (through the mouth of one much old), suggested by Caland, is perhaps, a better reading and Hauer's interpretation of 'āsya' as 'something belonging to or derived from the mouth' i. e., 'speech', is not justified. There may also be a faint suggestion in this word, that in the opinion of the Brāhmaṇakāra, there were faults in their manner of chanting and reciting the songs and verses, which gradually led to their speech, becoming inaudible and unintelligible. Finally, the passage mentions that by the power of the verses of Arbuda, which have the introductory verse in Anuṣṭubh, the Vrātya casts off the old skin, as the serpent (arbuda) has discarded its dead skin,[1] which implies that the conversion (through Vrātya-stoma) is complete and the old practices are no more adhered to. In this way we see that the Jaiminīya presents a picture of the Vrātyas, who are different from the Brahman, only as far as their adherence to a different form of ritual is concerned. There is one other passage in the Jaiminīya, which mentions Pṛthu Vainya as questioning the heavenly Vrātyas, on the order of the chanting of the Pavamāna stotras (pṛthur ha vainyo divyān vrātpān papraccha).[2] This connection of Pṛthu Vainya with the 'divya vrātya's is also found in the Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, but in both instandes the reference to this discussion is rather abrupt and no clue is found as to how Pṛthu came to be linked up with the divine Vrātyas. Pṛthu Vainya, who apparently is identical with Pṛthin or Pṛthī of the earlier Saṃhitās and later Brāhmaṇas, though claimed to be the 'first consecrated among men' (cf. Śat.) in the later texts, remains more as a 'culture hero rather than as a real man'.[3] The epithet 'vainya', however, clearly indicates that he is to be associated with the 'Vainyas', one of the groups among the Kevala Bhṛgus. In the Sūtra texts 'pārtha' appears as one of the pravara Ṛṣis of the Vainya and hence Pṛthu Vainya must be considered as one of their eponymous ancestors. That the 'Śatapatha'[4] and the Taittirīya[5] should mention Pṛthin or Pṛthī Vainya as the first consecrated Kṣatriya, is quite understandaable, if we believe in the traditional Kṣatriya origin of the Kevala gaṇas. The only reason then for 'Pṛthu' being placed in juxtaposition to Vrātyas seems to be that in all probability the vainyas were looked upon as Vrātyas. Such a possibility cannot be denied as they

---

[1] Op. cit.

---

[1] cf. S. B. III. 1.4.2.

---

1. 'so vā arbudasy ṛkṣu bhavaty; arbudo vai sarpa etābhih mṛtām tvacam apāghnata......,mṛtām tvacaṃ apahata,......mṛtāṃ evaitābhis tvacaṃ apaghnate'.
2. I. 276-77.
3. cf. V. I. II.
4. V. 3. 5. 4.
5. See above.

certainly came to be established as important clans only in the post-Vedic times.[1] The Panuranic account of Pṛthu clearly has nothing to do with this Vrātya chief.

The Tāṇḍya Mahābrāhmaṇa refers to the Vrātyas in two different contexts. In the seventeenth chapter, they are described in connection with the Vrātyastoma, while in XXIV. 18., they are said to have performed the 61 day sacrifice. Further, the former conerns itself mainly with the story of the divine Vrātyas. It is needless to mention that the Vrātyas in the earlier passage are not yet brought within the Brahmanical pale. The latter account being shorter than the former one, deserves consideration first.

It is interesting to note, that the Tāṇḍya alone, clearly relates the actual sacrificial performances of the 'brātya' ('br.' in stead of 'vr.')—in the edition surely seems to be a modern editor's idiosyncrasy who are the same as the Vrātyas mentioned in the Jaiminīya. The 61 day sacrifice is definitely a form of he Soma sacrifice. The Atirātra (a) Prāyaṇīya, Abhiplava, Pṛṣṭha, Abhijit, Viśvajit, Abhiplava, Āyu, Gauḥ, Dvādaśāha, Māhāvrata, Atirātra (b) mentioned here are all sacrifices or component parts of sacrifices classed under the great Soma—yāgas mentioned in the Brāhmaṇas and also in later literature. The association of the Sthapati Buddha with the Daiva-Vrātyas, reminds us of the Jaiminīya passage though the reading is slightly different here : "Daivā vai Vrātyāḥ sattram āsata budhena sthapatinā" (the divine Vrātyas performed a Sattra with Budha as their sthapati). It must be pointed out in this connection that Caland's supposition that 'Daiva' is probably formed from 'deva' (a certain deity, who must be identical with him who is the lord of animals in the Śat., 'yo yam devah paśūnāṃ īṣṭe'; Īśāna of the Jaiminiya, and Rudra of the Aitareya III. 34. 3., and Kath. X. 6.; XXII. 12; XXV. 10),[1] leading him to translate it as 'adherents of a God' is baseless. The opening sentence of the seventeenth chapter 'devā vai svargaṃ lokam āyaṃs teṣām daivā ahīyanta' (the gods went to heaven, their divine followers were left

---

1. cf. 'Early History of the Gotras'. Op. cit. 88.
2. Pv. Br.—Trans.

behind) proves that these are divine beings having relationship with gods in general, and not adherents of a single 'God'. The similarity of the above passage with the Jaiminīya version follows in the next sentence : 'they performed the consecration (ceremony) without having asked King Varuṇa for the place of worship; the King Varuṇa cursed them (saying) "I separate you from the fruits of sacrifice, you shall not know the path that leads to the gods".[1] The incidental reference to Varuṇa here is interesting. The deity who feels effended, and pierces the divine Vrātyas, with injury in sacrifice in the Jaiminīya (yajñasy ārtyā' vidhyat) is either Īśāna or Vāyu, but here Varuṇa takes their place. The royal title of Varuṇa appearing in this context, presupposes that the deity who is often associated with Soma, and has the characteristic designation of the Ādityas is meant.[2] It is appearent that he is the deity presiding over sacrifices and hence punishes those who transgress the rules of offering. Īśāna the same as Rudra, and vāyu cannot be considered to be identical with Varuṇa, as their conneetion with the Brahmanical sacrifices is not referred to in any of the texts. Neither can 'īśāna deva' be considered as referring to Varuṇa, as Mukerjee surmises, as Varuṇa is nowhere described as the 'great god'. The only reason for this change of deities is perhaps this, that the Jaiminīya version being the older one refers to the traditional deities of Vrātyas, whereas the latter brings in the Brahmanical deity Varuṇa implying that most of the Vrātyas had been converted by this time, though their complete assimilation had not yet been achieved. The offence committed also assumes a specific form in the Tāṇḍya. The grave omission of the recitation of the mantra : 'deva varuṇa devayajanan odehi' (Ap. S. S. X. 2. 9. 10) is not directly referred to in the Jaiminīya, and consequently seems to be added as an after thought to lay blame deliberately on the ritual practices of the Vrātyas. Here again, there is no incident stated or implied, which could lead one to agree with Hauer, in maintaining, that a struggle of different forms of religion is intended to be conveyed. At the utmost it is only a struggle between two different forms of ritual, the one adhered to by the Brahman, the other by the Vrātya. The reconciliation is effected in the actual initiation of the Sthapati Budha, who is characteristically named by the Brāhmaṇakāra as the 'son of Soma'. Further, this great initiation was the cause of happiness to all.[1]

---

[1] 'te ha vā anirvācya varuṇam rājānam devāya janam didikṣus tān ha varuṇo rājā-nuvyājahār antaremi vo yajñiyād bhāgadheyānna devayānaṃ panthanaṃ pra jñāśyatheti'.

[2] Bergaigne—Rel. Ved. III. 131.

The seventeenth chapter, also opens with a reference to the Vrātyas among gods. 'Vrātyām pravasantaḥ' at the end of the sentence is explained by Sāyaṇa as "being away from (their companions-other gods), after having attained 'vrātyatā', i.e., fallen from the customs'.[2] This interpretation is undoubtedly based on the later conception of the Vrātya as an outcaste. It is clear, however, that 'pravasantaḥ' stands merely for 'pravāsaṃ kurvantaḥ' (living outside). Hauer's rendering 'Vrātyawandering' cannot be justified even in this context. Caland's suggestion that it is an 'elliptic form of 'vrātyāṃ vasatim pravasanti' is very reasonable. The translation[3] that he proposes connecting 'vrātya' with 'vrata', ('joined group', according to him) does not make much sense in the present context. If, hoewer, 'vrātyā' as in 'vrātyām adhāvayan', implies here also the special cercmonies of the Vrātyas, the reason for their staying outside the Brahman territory can be easily understood. In other words, their unorthodox practices compelled them to stay outside the field of Brahman influence.

The phrase 'vrātyāṃ pravasanti' is repeated in XV. 1I. 1. 2., in the context of the Vrātyas among mortals. 'Those (among men), the deprived ones, who reside abroad leading the Vrātya way of life, are (further) deprived' (hīnā vā ete hiyante ye vrātyāṃ pravasanti). The repetition of the root 'hā' meaning 'to be left behind or deprived of' in 'hiyante' is probably to emphasize the fact, that whereas the heavenly Vrātyas were separated from the gods, the mortal Vrātyas were segregated both from the Brahmanical gods, and the Brahmans. Then follows the statement: 'na hi brahmacaryaṃ caranti na kṛṣiṃ na vāṇijyāṃ (neither do they perform the duties of the Brahman, nor do they practise agriculture or trade). The censure, significantly points to the fact that they were neither Brahmans nor Vaisyas, or rather, that they did not give themselves up to the vocation of either the Brahman or the Vaiśya. Keith,[1] in agreement with Weber, finds here a reference to their nomadic life.

---

[1] 'mahīṃ dīkṣāṃ saumāyano budho yad udayacchad anandatsarvaṃ. XXIV. 18.6.

[2] 'vrātyatām ācāra hīnatāṃ prāpya pravasantaḥ'.

[3] 'leading the life of a "joined group".

It has been suggested by Mukerjee, in this connection that 'na hi Brahmacaryaṃ caranti' implies the non-adherence (of the Vrātyas) to the Vedic rules[2] pertaining to 'brahmacarya' (studentship). It is not possible, according to him, to infer from this, that the Vrātya was not a student of the vedas as Lāṭyāyana clearly refers to scholars among them.[3] Further, in his opinion, the simultaneous occurence here of 'brahmacarya', 'kṛṣi' (agriculture) and 'vāṇijyā' (trade) recalls to our mind Gautama's statement that the Brahman may add 'kṛṣi' and 'vāṇijyā' to his principal duty of 'adhyayana, (study), employing someone else, however, for the performance of these secondary duties; and consquently leads us to conclude that in this passage, reference is made to Brahmans who do not perform their studies in the manner prescribed by the Vedas.[4]

That 'brahmacaryaṃ' in the Brāhmaṇas usually has the sense of religious (theological) studentship[5] cannot be denied. Again, accompanied by the root 'car', it mostly implies the idea of a 'brahmacārin' (student)[6] or 'performing studentship', and there is no reason why it should not have the same significance here. The statement of Lāṭyāyana presents to contradiction, as the only inference that can be drawn from it is that there were some among the Vrātyas who studied the Veda[1] or Vedas, and not that the study of the veda had become their principal occupation, as it was in the case of the Brahman. Moreover, there is no evidence for the existence of a distinct form of Vrātya studentship opposed to that of Brahman studentship. Neither is there any ground for connecting the statements of so late an authority as Gautama in a totally different context, with these phrases in the Brāhmaṇas. It is, however, better to render 'brahmacaryaṃ' in the sense of the duties to be performed by the Brahman, since there is possibly a hint here, to the misconduct[2] too, of the Vrātya. It is not impossible even in those days the sense of 'brahmacarya' was not strictly limited to the study of the Vedas, and involved the idea of the 'general conduct' of the Brahmans. 'Kṛṣi' and 'vāṇijya' are undoubtedly the traditional professions of the Vaiśya, and there is hardly any ground to think of these as referring in this passage to the subsidiary occupations of the Brahman.

---

[1] See above.

[2] He refers in particular to those appearing in the Dharma Sūtras of Gautama and Āpastamba.

[1] Lat. S. S. VIII. 6-2. 'ya eṣām adhyayane 'bhikrāntitamaḥ' who, amidst them (the Vrātyas) is the foremost scholar' (literally 'most conversant with the study of the Vedas')

[2] Op. cit. 154.

[3] cf. Eggeling. S. B. E. XLIV. 86.

[4] cf. Sāyaṇa : 'brahmacāriṇo bhavo brahmacaryam'.

The next interesting passage in the Tāṇḍya, throwing light on our problem is XVII. 1. 9., the explanation of which has been a matter of controversy amongst those interested in the subject, as is evident from the review in the opening pages of this chapter. The passage states: 'Swallowers of poison are these (Vrātyas), who (a) eat sacrificial food, which is worthy of being consumed (only) by Brahmans, (and as such) foreign to them; (b) say sentences that are not wrongly uttered, being as if wrongly uttered (c) are engaged in beating with a stick, that which is not to be beaten (by a stick) and (d) though not initiated, yet utter the speech of the initiated'.[3] The four sins (pāpmāno) of the Vrātyas mentioned here, from which they are released by the magic power of the 16th stoma (tena pāpmāno 'dhi nirmucyante), leads us to infer that they are people whose actions were directly opposed to those or the orthodox Brahmans. It is difficult to determine the sphere or spheres with which these non-Brahmanical acts of the Vrātyas are connected. They may be, in fact, their common practices or may have some special connection with their ritual performances. It seems, however, from the context that at least 'annam adanti', 'duruktaṃ āhuḥ', and 'dīkṣita-vācam vadanti' can be considered as sins only if they indicate the mistakes committed by the Vrātyas during their observance of certain rites. In other words it is only in the background of rituals that these can be looked upon as sinful by the Brahmans, whose authority in such matters was unchallenged by others. Consequently we have to give to 'daṇḍena ghnantaḥ' too, an interpretation which would fit in with the above context.

---

[1] The Atharvaveda only.

[2] cf. Vājasaneyi. XXX. where he is dedicated to 'the Gandharvas and and Apsarasas'.

[1] garagiro vā ete ye brahmādyaṃ janyam annam adanti; aduruktavākyaṃ duruktam ahur; adaṇḍyam daṇḍena ghnantaś caranti; adīkṣitadīkṣita-vācaṃ vadanti.

As different translations have been proposed by scholars with reference to this passage, a consideration of each of them may be useful, but since Hauer has already referred to them in a separate section of one of the sub-chapters of his book, under the heading 'The explanation of T. M. Br. XVII. 1. 9.',[1] there is no need for more repetition. The inferences of Ghosh and Mukerjee, however, which have not found place in this section, and Hauer's own conclusions, which have not been taken up for discussion by any scholar uptil now, may be duly considered here.

Ghosh suggests an emendation in the text: 'carantaḥ' for 'caranti' and 'dīkṣitā' for 'adīkṣitā', and thinks that 'ye brahmādyaṃ janyaṃ annam adanti' is 'mutilated', the addition of a 'na' either between 'ye' and 'brahmādyam' or between 'janyam' and 'annam' being necessary for a clear understanding. His acceptance of 'dīkṣitā' instead of 'adīkṣitā' is based on 'the reading according to a copy of the commentary on Lāṭ. Śr. S., in the Dacca University Library', and thus the sentence in the passage (dīkṣitā adīkṣita-vācam vadanti), according to him should mean 'ability to pick up Aryan speech after conversion'. For the other suggestions, he adduces no proper evidence.

---

[1] Op. cit.—155-179.

These corrections are not necessary in any way as even in its extant form, the passage makes sense, and the above manuscript either has a wrong reading or the corruption of the text is exemplary of the carelessness of a modern editor. 'Dīkṣita-vācam' cannot mean 'Aryan speech' by any stretch of imagination.

Mukerjee, on the other hand, suggests in this connection: (a) 'garagiro vā' etc. should be taken seperately, conveying the idea that the Vrātyas were 'drinkers of Surā', as Surā, in spite of being unusually considered impure and like poison in contrast to Soma, which is pure and 'amṛta' (nectar), was declared to the food capable of being offered to the 'pitṛ's (manes) and as such could be consumed only if it was purified. The Vrātyas obviously did not attach importance to this act of purification. Thus they were eaters of poison; (b) 'brahmādyaṃ janyam annaṃ' is food, proper for the Brahmans after purification, and cooked in the market place, as can be inferred from Baudhāyana's statements : (the gods created for the Brahmans three means of purification, e.g., ignorance of defilement, sprinkling with water, and commending by word of mouth,[1] and 'food which is cooked out of sight must be illuminated (with fire) and be sprinkled with water; likewise eatables brought in the market.)[2] The Vrātyas took such food without going through this process and thus defied the rule; (c) 'adurukta-vākyaṃ duruktam āhuḥ' refers to expressions 'which to Vaidika people were according to Vaidika directions, not obscure or indecent,' being declared to be so by the Vrātyas. Such an obscene verse, recitable according to the Śrauta injunctions appears in Lāṭ.4.3; the fourth characteristic point to 'striking of Brahmans, who are 'adaṇḍya' (unpunishable) by Vaidika ordination' : (e) the last phrase 'adīkṣitā dīkṣita-vācam vadanti' conveys the idea of the restraining of speech by the Vrātyas in spite of the fact they were not initiated, as according to the Śat-Br.[1] the dīkṣita restrains speech and speaks falteringly (parihvalaṃ vācam vadati). These suggestions would have been useful, if they had been based on citations from contemporary texts and not on the later Dharma Sutras. Thus it may be indicated that (a) 'garagiro' etc., cannot be taken separately, as it is more or less a figurative expression and cannot be interpreted to literally; (b) 'janyaṃ annam' has a certain technical sense, which shall be discussed later on, and there is no evidence inthe Brāhmaṇas for any such restriction regarding food cooked outside or bought in the market place; (c) 'aduruktavākyaṃ' does not necessarily mean a sentence, which, in spite of having obscene words, is declared to be recitable, and contrarily there are no phrases to be found in the early Vedic literature, which were specifically given the designation 'durukta-vākyaṃ; (d) the 'adaṇḍya' state of the Brahman is easily inferrable from the highest ascendancy of this class in those days, but certainly there is no reference in any of the texts to the Vrātyas beating a Brahman, and hence 'adaṇḍyaṃ daṇḍena ghnantaś caranti' must convey a totally different sense: (e) 'parihvālaṃ vācaṃ' in the Śatapatha is not the same as 'dīṣkita-vācam', since it is merely an explanation of 'vācaṃ ca yachhanti' (restrain speech), which appears also in the same context.

---

[1] III. 2.2.27.

The conclusions of Hauer, apparently imply that he has in mind the connection of these acts with the primitive rites of heretics. He himself says : 'we have here, therefore, the entire range of primitive rites, for we may presume that in this single connection only catch-words are given, so to say a ritual-abbreviation of all forms of heretic priesthood and magic-work, which has given to Vrātyas the appelation 'garagīr' as in the case of one of the Asura ? priests Uśanas and the two heretics Ṛṣis Gauṣūkti and Aśvaṣūkti.[1] According to him: (1) the 'garagīr' is the poison-eater, the heretic who 'suffers from his former heresy' (seiner einstigen Ketzteral leidet), (a) the mention of poison-eaters among gods in Tai. Ar.I.9.3., (raśmayaś ca devā garagiraḥ—' the resplendent gods the takers of poison'), (b) the name of the Ṛṣis in the Kāt.Ś. XL.8, appearing as 'Gara-gīrṇin' (the swallower of poison), (c) the story of Uśanas Kāvya, who had partaken of poison-food in the company of the Asuras, and had to perform the Punaḥ-stoma (the repeated sacrifice) coming to the narrated

---

1. Op. Cit. 179 (Trans. mine)

in the Jaiminīya (I.126.II.83.84.), the Tāṇḍya (XVII.46-47) and B.S.S.; and finally (d) the reference to the two seers Gauṣūkti Aśvaṣūkti, as 'two poison-swallowers' (garagirau) again in the Tāṇḍya (XIX.4.10); (2) 'janyam annaṃ was originally a technical term for the food for relatives, or the family-food, at the sacrifice to the Manes[2] and legally was not to be taken by the participants in the sacrifice (rechtmaessig von den opfereteilnehmern nicht gegessen werden), as can be inferred from the Taittirīya (I.3.10.6.)[1] and the Ṣaḍviṃśa (I.7.3.).[1] Further, there are four possible inferences from 'brahmādyaṃ janyam annaṃ adanti', e.g. (a) without observing the orthodox ceremonies, they eat 'brahmādya', which was as holy as the orthodox 'brahmaudana', to the heretics, and identical with the 'odana' boiled without fire by the two heretic magicians Kilāta and Ākuli;[2] (b) they eat 'janya' food, i.e. family food (the predicative attribute 'brahmādya' being added as a substantive); (c) they eat the 'atithi' (guest) meal, (for which the name 'janya-anna' and the substantive predicate 'brahmādya' are used); (d) they eat 'janya' food (the adjectival predicate 'brahmādya' qualifying it);[2] (3) 'durukta' in the Ṛgveda, means curse (cf.I.49.8.9; 147.4), and 'adurukta-vākyaṃ duruktam āhuḥ' implies 'they declare a curse, an abusive word, as not for curse, as for or reversely they declare a word not for curse, as for a curse' (die einen Fluch, ein Schahmwort nicht fur einen Fluch erklaren, order umgekehrt, die ein Nicht-fluchwort fuer einen Fluch erklaren).[3] This 'unholy speech' is itself, in fact brought into the sphere of orthodoxy in connection with a ceremony, well-known as the 'mahāvrata' known to have been performed by the Vrātyas with their 'gṛhapati' Khṣītaka, in which 'ill-utterence', 'abusing' etc., formed an important part of the ceremonial and were magically effective as is clear from the following: (a) 'anyaḥ krośati prānyaḥ śaṃsati; ya ākrośati' punāti eva enān, sa yaḥ praśaṃsati pūteṣv eva annādyam

---

1. urspruenglich terminus technicus fuer das Sippen oder Geschlechtermahl beim Manen opfer gewesen ist.
2. J.B. III. 168.
3. Op. Cit. 167-168.
4. Ibid. 169.

dadhāti'[1] ('One abuses, the other praises; he who abuses purifies these, that he praises, he places food among the purified), (b) the phallic dialogue between a Brahmacārin and Puṃścalu mentioned in Kat. Śr. S.XIII.3.4.;[2] (4) 'adaṇḍyaṃ daṇḍena ghnantaś caranti' as translated by others represents three different views (a) unjust judges; (b) 'beat those who are sacred' and (c) 'run about and beat innocent people', none of which is justifiable on grounds of philology and factual evidence. It may describe mercily a certain holy action of the unconverted Vrātya, e.g. the use of sticks for the expulsion of demons and spirits who are invisible enemies, and moving about in processional bands, which is regarded by the orthodox Brahmans as heretical, and instrumental in bringing misfortune to the executors. Further it is comparable with 'dhanuṣkeṇa aniṣuṇā vrātyāḥ prasedhamānā yanti sa jyāhṇodaḥ[3] ('the Vrātyas move about driving others, with the bow, without the arrow—that is jyāhṇoda'); (5) 'adīkṣitā dīkṣita-vācaṃ vadanti' refers to the heretic initiation ceremony of the Vrātyas in which they had some from of expression analogous to the orthodox 'dīkṣita-vāda', mentioned in the Śatapatha—'dīkṣito' yaṃ brāhmaṇaḥ—('this one, consecrated is a Brahman'),[4] and explained by Baudhāyana as 'yad vrātya-vādaṃ vadati dīkṣita vādhasya tadrūpaṃ' ('that he utters the speech of the 'Vrātya' he uses the form of the speech of the initiated').[5] It has connection with the pronunciation of the Aryan language.

Summing up, Hauer states that in his opinion, this passage describes four Vrātya-ceremonies; (a) sacred meal (sakrale Mahlzeiten); (b) curse and fertility rite in which the 'durukta' was used (Fluch und Fruchtbarkeitazauber, bei denen 'durukta' gebraucht wurde); (c) expulsion of the demons and spirits with the help of the magical bow (Demonen-und Geisterasatreibungen mit Hilfe des magischen Bogenstonckes) and (d) initiation (Weihezeremonien).[6]

---

[1] cf. Ap. Ś. S. XXI. 17. 19; Lat. Ś. S. IV. 3.9.
[2] Lat. Ś. S. VIII. 6.9.
[3] Lat, Ś. S. VIII. 6.9.
[4] III. 2.1.39.
[5] B. S. S.
[6] Op. Cit. 179.

These deductions of the Hauer seem to over-emphasize the ceremonial implications of this passage. He unnecessarily tries to find similarity, between presumable Vrātya observances and definite orthodox Brahmanic rites, for which the evidence he cites is insufficent. With reference to 'garagir', as has been already stated, it can hardly be denied that the expression is used metaphorically and cannot be interpreted literally, yet the inference he draws from it, that it refers to the heretic who is troubled by his former heresy, is not possible. It is true that 'garagīr' has a special sense in the Brāhmaṇas and the Sūtras, being especially used for expressing contempt, both for 'one who has accepted gifts not to be accepted', and 'one who has partaken of the food belonging to him whose food is non-consumable'; (apratigṛhyasya pratigṛhya; anāśyānnasyannam aśitvā). This, however, does not suggest the idea of 'former heresy'. Moreover, there is no evidence in the related texts to prove that Gara-gīrṇin, Uśanas, Gauṣūkti and Aśvaṣūkti, were all heretic Ṛṣis. Nothing is known of Garagīrṇin. Uśanas is represented mythically as the Purohita of the Asuras, and Gauṣūkti and Aśvaṣūkti are both called 'Aiśas' (the descendants of Īśa). Further, in the Jaiminīya Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa,[1] 'Gauṣūkti' is mentioned after 'Īśa Śyāvāśvī' in the Vaṃśa list.

Next, 'brahmādya', which also appears in the Tāṇḍya[2] in the context of the 'Atirātra', and in the Aitareya in that of the Vaṣat call, connected with the Āśvina Śastra,[3] means nothing more than 'sacrificial food', specially worthy of being consumed by the Brahman. It may be identical with 'brahmaudana' (rice-gruel), though it is rather difficult to attach such a specific significance to 'brahmādya'. It is natural that such food should be consiedred to be holy in the ritualistic context of the Brāhmaṇas. It is, however, inconceivable that a specially sacred meal of the Vrātyas, cooked in a different manner[1] for ceremonial purposes, would be referred to by orthodox Brahmans, as 'brahmādya'. Similar is the case with 'janyam annaṃ', which, as we have pointed out above, probably emphasizes the foreignness and impropriety of food in the context of the Ṣaḍviṃśa and the Taittirīya references to ancestral sacrifices. There is hardly any reason to believe that the original Vrātya cult was specially connected with ancestral sacrifices, and funeral offerings (Manenopfer, Totenopfern).

---

[1] IV. 16.

[2] X. 4.5. 'ajarasam brahmādyam annaṃ' —Hauer interprets 'ajarasaṃ annaṃ' as 'eternal food' (die ewige speise), and imagines 'brahmādya' to be a divine elixir of life, (ein himmlisches Lebenselixier), the 'immortal food' (Unstorblichkeitsspeise) comparable with Amṛta (nectar). Caland, on the other hand, probably has the reading 'ajarasaṃ' and translates 'he eats resplendent until old age, food suitable for Brahmins'. (P. B. tr. 234)

[3] IV. 11. Hauer construes 'brahmādya' here as 'celestial magic-food (uberirdische Wunderspeise), illuminated and produced by Brahman' (brahman-Glanz und brahman—Macht). Keith renders it as 'food made edible by the holy power' (R. B. 206).

Neither can the atithi-Mahl be supposed to have the name of 'janya' food, as the more or less mystic description of the common reception of the guest in A.V.XV., who is a Vrātya, 'bhakṣayati viśvarūpaṃ' (feeds the guest on every form there is on earth) does not literally refer to any specific 'atithi'-Meal or 'family-meal'. Moreover, the oneness of the mystic atithi with the Vrātya, found only in the A.V., and Apas. Dh.S.II.3.7., presumes a ritual, which could not be in any way different from the orthodox ceremony of 'guest reception'. The interpretation of 'brahmādya', therefore, as 'the celestial food of the highest rank of the mystical atithi, i.e., the Vrātya' (von den Vrātya als uberirdische Speise als 'brahmādya' betrachtet wird), is not based on any textual evidence. Finally, none of the modes suggested by Hauer with regard to the explanation of the sentence 'brahmādyam janyaṃ annaṃ adanti' seem feasible, and it may be suggested that both 'brahmādya' and 'janya' here should be taken as adjectives qualifying 'anna'. The sense then would be that the Vrātyas ate food which, being suitable only for the Brahmans, was foreign to them, and as such not fit to be consumed by them.

There is some justification for taking 'durukta' as 'curse' in R̥.V.I.4 .8.9., since it comes together with 'śap' (to curse) and 'prati-vac', but in the Brāhmaṇas it never has the sense of 'curse'.[1] Neither can there be any ground for Hauer's rendering 'unholy speech', as it is based on a wrong understanding of Sāyaṇa's comment 'adurukta-vākyaṃ śobhanārthapratipādakam vākyaṃ, duruktaṃ duṣṭaṃ āhuḥ' (they declare a sentence conveying the correct meaning, as being inappropriate). Śobhana', in the sense of 'welfare' or luck (Heil) may be possible, but combined with 'artha' (meaning) it certainly has a different meaning. 'Kāśyapasya śobhanaṃ' referring to a Sāman again, has no affinity with Sāyaṇa's 'śobhanārthapratipādakaṃ vākyaṃ'. The phrase 'avratam amedhyaṃ vadanti' in the Jaiminīya, may be compared with 'adurukta-vākyaṃ duruktaṃ āhuḥ', but while the former refers to utterance of that which is considered improper for religious observances and sacrifices, the later implies that the Vrātyas, in their ceremonies, spoke wrongly a sentence which was rightly uttered in the context of the orthodox rites. Thus both these phrases are not completely identical. In the Jaiminīya stress is laid on the use of prayers and formulae considered to be improper in the opinion of the orthodox ritualists, whereas in the Tāṇḍya, presumably the incorrect form of recitation of verses ritually prescribed, is hinted at. Further, the connection that Hauer supposes this statement has with the above-mentioned 'Arya-Śūdra' dispute and the phallic dialogue between the religious student and the Hetira or the Māgadha presumes two primary conditions, e.g., the association of the Vrātya with the Mahāvrata, and the labelling of this dispute and dialogue as 'unholy speech' by the Brāhmaṇakāras, both of which are not evidenced by the texts. There is no proof for the performance of the Mahāvrata by the unconverted Vrātya, and though these peculiar rites associated with the Mahāvrata, may have been borrowed from some primitive forms of ritual, yet are not necessarily of Vrātya origin. Similarly, nowhere in the extant Brāhmaṇas are the dispute and the dialogue forming a part of 'the Mahāvrata' considered to be unholy.

---

[1] The comparison of the 'odana' cooked without fire by the two enchanters Kilāta and Ākuli, (mentioned in the Jaiminīya) with the special 'brahmādya' of the Vrātyas, is far from possible, as the only thing said about these two magicians is that they were dependents of the Asuras (Asura-māyāvinau), which does not presuppose that they were Vrātyas.

1. cf. 'duruktokta' in A. B.
2. 'Sthaviratarasy-āsyena' in the Jaiminīya, as suggested above, leads us to a similar assumption.

Regarding the phrase 'adaṇḍyaṃ daṇḍena ghnantaś caranti', it is apparent that it does not refer to any of the judicial practices of the Vrātyas, since a ritualistic context of the whole passage, as suggested above, presupposes that a detail of the ritual is also implied here. Hauer is fully justified in maintaining that 'adaṇḍyaṃ' cannot refer to Brahmans or women-folk, as the beating of these with a stick, is nowhere mentioned in the early texts, and such a practice surely could not be referred to, especially by the Brahman compilers, in such an unusual manner. Moreover, 'daṇḍa' is mostly used in the Brāhmaṇas, in the sense of the 'staff of the initiated' (cf. daṇḍopānaha), or the implement used for the churning of the Soma liquor in sacrifice. Carried again, however, by his eagerness for connecting the Vrātya with the primitive tribes, Hauer fails to provide any evidence from related texts for his deduction that the above sentence conveys the idea of the Vrātyas moving in processional bands, like aboriginal tribes, and trying to scare away the demons and spirits who were literally unpunishable, being wholly invisible. Even if these characteristics could be linked up with the Vrātyas, such 'demons' and 'spirits' could not possibly be mentioned by the Brāhmaṇakāra as 'adaṇḍya', especially in connection with some ritual. The parallelism between this and the explanation of 'jyāhṇoda' in the Lāṭ. Ś.S. (dhanuṣkena aniṣuṇā vrātyāḥ prasedhamānā yānti, sa jyāhṇodah) is certainly far from being possible, as the notion of 'adaṇḍya' is nowhere suggested or implied in the Sūtra reference. Further, 'daṇḍa' in our context cannot stand for 'dhanurdaṇḍa' even if we accept Kātyāyana's explanation of 'jyāhṇoda' (as understood by the commentator) 'kevalo dhanur-daṇḍaḥ', as being the correct one, since we do not find this abbreviated form being used in the Brāhmaṇas, to convey the idea of 'the rod of the bow'.

Finally, it cannot be denied that 'adīkṣitā dīkṣitavācaṃ vadanti' has to be understood, in conjunction with 'yad-vrātyavādaṃ vadanti dīkṣita-vādasya tad rūpaṃ (that he utters the speech of the Vrātya, that is the form of the speech of the initiated) of Baudhāyana,[1] as was also pointed out by

---

[1] B. S. S. XVIII. 24.

Caland. Here too, 'speaking the language of the initiated' cannot refer to the common language of the Vrātyas, as it has to be linked with the ritual. 'The speech of the initiated' (dīkṣita-vāda) cannot be identical with 'dīkṣito' yam brāhmaṇa' of the Śatapatha, as the latter is uttered by the priests other than the Adhvaryu and not by the sacrificer, and as such the inference is not possible that the Vrātyas had some form of expression analogous to this, which they uttered during their initiation ceremony. On the other hand, the uttering either of a Ṛk, a Yajuṣ or Sāman by the consecrated after restraining his speech,[1] may be implied in 'dīkṣitavāda'. Hauer is, however, right in understanding 'parihvālaṃ vācaṃ' as an explanation or 'restrain speech' (vācaṃ ca yacchanti), but one certainly cannot, 'with good reason', name this speech as 'dīkṣita-vāc'. (Diese Rede konnte man mit gutem Recht diksitavac nennen). Nor does Sāyaṇa's explanation, 'dīkṣitaiḥ prayojyām vācaṃ vadanti' (they utter the speech that was to be used by the initiated ones), lead to a similar conclusion, as 'restraining speech' is not the same as 'uttering speech'. It is again most unlikely that while the Tāṇḍya refers to 'stammering speech', the Śrauta Sūtra of Baudhāyana concerns itself more with the 'declaration of this initiation', as such an arguement is based merely on the slight difference in form between 'dīkṣitavāc' (Tāṇḍya), and 'dīkṣita-vāda' (Baudhāyana), and a strained grammatical derivation of the latter, which yields the meaning, 'a form of speech in which the initiated is spoken to by the priests'. Still further, the hypothesis, that the orthodox initiation ceremony may have been borrowed from an analogous heretical ceremony, which existed previously, is not very convincing, in spite of the comparatively recent character of the initiation ceremony described in the Śatapatha, since little is known about the so-called primitive rites.

From the above examination, it is clear that Hauer's deductions in this context are not justifiable. An apparent similarity between the performance of Vrātya-rites and that of the Brahmanical rites, seems undeniable, but one cannot be specific upon this point. It may, however, be suggested that the practice of the Vrātyas of 'beating him with a stick, who is unpunishable' has a close parallel in the 'symbolic beating of the king with sticks by the Adhvaryu and other priests, in order to carry him over judicial punishment'[1] in the context of the Rājasūya. It is possible that this is a remnant of an older form of the Rājasūya'.

---

[1] cf. Sat. III. 2.1.37.

Of some interest again, is the description of the outfit associated with the Gṛhapati, or the chief of the Vrātyas, and also that of the Vrātyas in general. Thus, 'a turban, a goad, a jyāhṇods, a vipatha covered with boards, a black garment, two skins, black and white, a silver 'niṣka are of the Gṛhapati'[2] Before we ascertain the meaning of certain peculiar words used here, it is necessary to determine whether all the items stated here belong to the gṛhapati, or are merely received by him as sacrificial gift (dakṣiṇā). Sāyaṇa, in his comment on this passage, significantly mentions that all these forms of equipment are 'the personal belongings of the gṛhapati, and are to be brought by the gṛhapati for the purpose of (making) sacrificial gifts' (gṛhapateḥ svabhūtāni sampādyāni, dakṣiṇārthaṃ gṛhapatinā ānetavyānī' tyarthah) "for which there is the evidence of the Sūtrakāra (Lāṭyāyana), who says: 'All these the gṛhapati should being' (tad uktaṃ sūtrakāreṇa etat sarvam āhared) and hence 'the genetive form gṛhapateḥ should not be mistaken for the dative, as (in the context) of the garland of the Udgātā (ataḥ srag udgātur iva tad gṛhapateḥ ṣaṣṭhyā nirdiṣṭasya sampradāna-śaṅkā na kārye tyarthaḥ). That Sāyaṇa is right in construing the passage in this manner is confirmed by the statement of the Brāhmaṇa:[3] 'this is the wealth of the Vrātyas; they go wiping off (their sins) on him to whom they give this' (etad vai vrātyadhanaṃ yasmā etad dadāti tasminneva mṛjānā yanti). The recipients are, according to the Sūtrakāras, 'those who have not discontinued their Vrātya practices, or are Brahma-bandhus and Māgadhadeśiyas.[1] Āpastamba too, says 'that which is dear to them should be given to them, that is the wealth of the Vrātyas'. (Atha khalv ahur yadev aiṣāṃ śatam syāt tad dadyus tad dhi vrātya-dhanaṃ iti).[2] Baudhāyana goes to the extent of presenting the Sthapati as equipped with this outfit. (kṛṣṇa-tūṣam paridhatte : kṛṣṇṣam uṣṇīsaṃ dhārayati).[3] Thus Hauer is justified in taking the 'gṛhapati' here as the 'giver' and not the 'recipient' of the sacrificial gifts.[4]

---

[1] Śat. V. 4. 4. 7 'athainaṃ pṛṣṭhatas tūṣṇīm eva daṇḍair ghnanti taṃ daṇḍair ghnanto daṇḍavadhaṃ atinayanti',

[2] XVII. 1. 'uṣṇīṣaṃ ca pratodaś ca jyāhṇodaś ca vipathaś ca phalakāstīrṇah, kṛṣṇaśaṃ vāsaḥ kṛṣṇa-valakse ajine, rājato niṣkaḥ tad gṛhapateh.

[3] T. B. XV. II. 1. 16.

The terms not easily explicable in this context are 'jyāhṇoda', 'vipatha' and 'niṣka'. Excepting 'niṣka', these words do not occur anywhere else in the Brāhmaṇas. It is, therefore, essential to take into consideration the views of the Śrauta-sūtra-kāras, who fortunately, have something to say in this connection. With reference to 'jyāhṇoda' there is hardly any unanimity in the interpretations given to it by them. Lāṭyāyana thinks it to be 'bow without arrow' (dhanuṣkeṇa aniṣuṇā), while Baudhāyana refers to it as 'tiṣr—dhanvam', which he himself specifies as 'a bow with leathern quivers (carmamayair bāṇavadbhiḥ). Kātyāyana, on the other hand, believes it to be 'ayogyaṃ dhanuḥ', which the commentator, explains as 'the rod of the bow without the string' (jyā-rahitarḥ kevalo dhanur-daṇḍah). The only inference that can possibly be drawn from these renderings is that it was a kind of bow, or at least was thought to be so by the Sūtra-kāras. With 'vipath', however, the Sūtra-kāras are in an agreement in maintaining it to be a 'ratha' (chariot) driven by two animals, difference of opinion is expressed in naming and specifying their stepping, and an attampt is made to impart authority to their interpretations, by quoting traditional views associated with Śāṇḍilya and Dhānañjaya. Lāṭyāyana calls it the 'chariot of the east' (prācya-ratha), which is driven by a horse and a mule with varied stepping, according to Śāṇḍilya, and by two horses and two mules with unsepecified stepping, according to Dhanañjayya. Kātyāyana quotes Lāṭyāyana almost verbatim, differing only in mentioning 'equal stepping' of the two animals. Āpastamba does not refer to their stepping and maintains that the horse and the mule are to be yoked to the chariot. Baudhāyana construes it merely as 'a delapidated, worn-out carriage' (jarat-kad-rathaḥ). Śāṇkhāyana has 'vipṛthu' instead of 'vipatha', which the commentator explains as a carriage with 'an elongated frame, a fearful-looking noose, and axis and wheels in tact' (vilamba-yantra-ugra-dām ājīrṇākṣacakraḥ). Here also, the deduction is simple, that a peculiar carriage, with which the Brāhmaṇa-kāra was not familiar is meant. 'Niṣka' is not commented upon by any of the Sūtra-kāras. The commentator to Lāṭ. Śr. S., refers to it as 'the well-known ornament, which is made of silver' (prajñātaḥ niṣko nāmālaṅkāra iti; sa rājato bhavati). Hauer compares it with the 'nusca' in High German, and concludes that it is a sacrificial ornament possibly worn around the neck, on the basis of the references to 'niṣka-grīva', 'niṣka-kaṇṭha' in R. V. V. 19. 3., A. V. V. 17.4. and the Aitareya (VIII. 22.), and the mention of 'the Adhvaryu putting it around the sacrificer's neck, and the sacrificer consequently returning it to him', in the Śatapatha in the contexts of the Aśvamedha.[1] This deducation seems logical, but his other contention that it (niṣka) is identical with the double-ornament of the unconverted Vrātya, mentioned by Baudhāyana as 'two Rukmas (made) of gold and silver' (suvarṇa-rājatau rukmau) (XVIII. 24), is purely conjectural as 'rukma' is an ornament not usually associated with 'grīva' (neck) but with 'vakṣas' (chest).[2] Similarly, the association of 'niṣkaṃ viśva-rūpaṃ' with Rudra (R. V. II. 33. 10), and the identity of the two 'rukmas' mentioned above with 'parigharmyau' (two sacrificial vessels of valuable material) used at the Pravargya ceremony, combined together cannot lead us to the conclusion that the Vrātya, Rudra and 'pravargya' are

---

[1] (vrātyebhyo vrātyadhanāni, ye vrātya-caryāyā aviratā syur brahma-bandhave va māgadhadeśīyaya). For 'brahmabanhdu' and 'māgadha-deśiya'—see the concluding pages of this chapter.

[2] XXII. 13. 'Vrātya-dhanaṃ' clearly refers to the possessions of the unconverted Vrātya.

[3] XVIII. 24.

[4] Op. cit. 74.

---

1. XIII. 4.1. dieser Doppelschmuck der unbekehrten Vrātya mit dem Niska der Vrātya-stoma ist identishch.
2. cf. 'rukma-vakṣas' in R. V.

closely connected, as 'rukma' and 'niṣka' are not the same, and 'niṣka' in the context of Rudra is difficult to interpret since the meaning of the epithet 'viśva-rūpaṃ' is not clear. Further the connection of 'niṣka' with 'parigharmya', inferrable from the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka IV. 5. 7., is symbolic. The argument (of Hauer) again, that both 'rukma' and 'niṣka', being mentioned together with the two 'parigharmya's should be identical to them, is not tenable, as such statements in these texts cannot be taken too literally. Separated from the ritual, these equations and connections have little meaning. It must also be pointed out that the 'niṣka' mentioned in the Śatapatha is probably a gold ornament, as the parallelism that follows in the statement regarding the significance of the above practice, is between 'gold' (hiraṇya) and 'age' (āyu). Here, however, as seen above, it is said to be of silver, which leads one to presume that the ornament was probably made of gold as well as silver.

From such an outfit it is obvious that the 'gṛhapati' was like a 'warrior-chief' who, apart from his other duties, had also to participate in and supervise over ritual performances. In this manner he could be compared with the Brahman Purohita who, in those days, was not only concerned with the performance of royal sacrifices, but was also the leader of armies in battles.

Next, with reference to the outfit of the other Vrātyas apart from that of 'gṛhapati', it is stated that 'valukānta's with two ribbons on each, two sandals each and two deer-skins joined together are for others' : ("valukāntāni dāma-tūṣāni itareṣāṃ dve dve dāmanī, dve dve upānahau dvi-saṃhitāny ajināni"). Here again, the articles mentioned are not the sacrificial gifts received by the Vrātyas, but their personal effects. As in the context of the Gṛhapati, so also in this passage the opinion of the Sūtrakāras has to be considered as the meanings of 'valukānta' and 'dāma-tūṣa' are not clear. Lāṭyāyana and Kātyāyana help us in understanding these two words. According to the former, (a) 'valukāntāni' with 'dāma-tūṣāṇi', combined with (b) 'dve dve dāmanī' describes the form of their garments (vasanani). Thus 'valukāntāni' stands for 'āvikāni lohita-pravāṇāni vasanāni' and 'dāma-tūṣāni' means 'dāma-daśāni: daśākhyā tuṣamiti'. The first specification in the words of the commentator refers to 'garments made of sheep-wool, interwoven with white woollen threads and sewn lengthwise with red ones', while the next one amounts to 'those (garments) with a knot on one side, and a fringe on the other',[1] Kātyāyana understands it slightly differently, e.g., 'woolen garments having two protuberances, with red or black seams' (dvicūḍāny āvikāni vāsāṃsi lohitāntāni kṛṣṇāntāni vā). Regarding 'dve dve dāmanī' Lāṭyāyana says 'garments with two fringes each (dve dve ekaikasya vasanasya daśe syātāṃ) while Kātyāyana does not comment on it. It is rather interesting to note that describing the sandals worn by the Vrātyas, Lāṭyāyana states that according to Śāṅdilya they are 'black and have protruded tipe' (kṛaṇāḥ karṇinyaḥ), whereas in the opinion of Dhānañjaya they may be of any description (yāḥ kāścit upānahau iti dhanañjayaḥ). Kātyāyana too quotes Śāṇḍily's opinion, though referring to him as 'eke' (some). Significantly Baudhāyana remarks : "in that he wears hoof-shaped sandals, (he thinks) 'Being consecrated I may not stand on that which is not proper for sacrifice" Hauer's translation of the last part of this sentence is incorrect and there is no need for changing 'khuryau' into 'khuryāntau', as only the shape of the sandals is described here and not the material from which they are made. It corresponds to 'karṇinyau' mentioned by the other Sūtrakāras.

These descriptions of the outfit of the Gṛhapati and the Vrātyas in general, Hauer imagines, give us the picture of the band of Vrātyas moving about in fantastically ceremonious garments, swaying the 'minds of a believing crowd'. (einer glaubigen Mengs). This assumption, again is characteristic of his eagerness to attribute a magical aspect to all articles belonging to the Vrātyas. The 'mystical meaning' (mystische Bedeutung), that he traces in these phrases describing the

---

1. (āvikāni ūrṇani; lohita-pravāṇāni, āvikena śuklena sūtreṇotānī syuḥ, lohitena protāni; yathā govandhāni dāmāni tatprakārāni syuḥ, teṣāṃ vāsasām ekaikasmin pārśve granthiḥ anyapārśve tūṣam iti daśākhyātūṣam iti.)

2. (yat khuryau upānahau ḍhaṛaẏati ned dīkṣitaḥ sann amedhyaṃ adhitiṣṭhāmīti).

equipment of the Vrātyas, is based on an erroneous conception of the so-called sanctity attached to all that concerns ritual in the Brāhmaṇas. There is nothing mentioned in the context of the Vrātya 'Ausrustung', which imparts to it a 'sakralen Charakter'. On the other hand, it is more reasonable to conclude, on the basis of these descriptions, that these Vrātyas were possibly Northeners, covering themselves up with woollen garments and carrying such things with them, which are usually associated with the Kṣatriya class. It may also be argued that the mention of the sandals of the Vrātyas is of some significance. In the context of the Rājasūya, with special reference to the Keśa-vapanīya (hair-cutting) ceremony, the Śatapatha states that the Kṣatriya sacrificer should put on shoes made of boar-skin, and never set his bare feet on earth.[1] This injunction appearing only in the context of the Kṣatriya performing the Rājasūya, lends confirmation to our inferences above that the sacrifice with which the Vrātya seems to be specially connected may have been similar to the orthodox Rājasūya, and that he resembles the Kṣatriya in many ways.

The sections II-IV of the above chapter (in the Tāṇḍya) are also worthy of consideration as they deal with the Vrātya-stomas to be performed specially by those among the Vrātyas who are (a) the 'nṛśaṃsa-nindita's, (b) the eldest members (jyeṣṭha) and (c) the youngest ones (kaniṣṭha). This division of the Vrātyas into groups is purely imaginary, and is used by the Brāhmaṇakāra to bring out more clearly the contemptible traits of the Vrātyas. With reference to the first group, it must be maintained with Hauer that it comprises of the 'nṛśaṃsas', who are also calumniated (nindita), and not of the 'nṛśaṃsas' and the 'nindita's as is clear from the text itself; 'ye nṛśaṃsā ninditāḥ santo vrātyām pravasanti' ('those 'nṛśaṃsas' who being censured carry out their Vrātya performances outside the sphere of Brahman influence'). Āpastamba's reference to this class of Vrātyas being represented by the 'nindita's instead of the nindita' (censured) 'nṛśaṃsa's involves no difference of opinion. The implication is clear that he uses here the short form 'ninditānāṃ' for 'ninditānāṃ nṛśamsānāṃ'.[1] The meaning of 'the magically potent invokers of curses' (die zauberkraeftigen Verflucher par excellence),[2] that Hauer gives to 'nṛśaṃsa', however, cannot be deemed to be correct. It cannot be denied that 'śaṃsa' in the Ṛgveda has both the senses of 'blessing' and 'curse', but never that of the 'pronouncer of the curse or blessing',[3] which we have to give to it if we accept Hauer's rendering of 'nṛśaṃsa' as 'Menschen verflucher' to be correct. The occurence of 'nṛśaṃsa' in place of 'śaṃsa', as attached to the name Bhaga in R.V.IX.81.5., which Bergaigne points out is equivalent to 'narāṃ śaṃsāḥ' (the praised among men) or to the irregular form 'naraśaṃsā' (eulogy of men) is of little significance, since the context widely differs from that of our passage. It may, however, be inferred from this that provided the sense of curse is applicable to 'śaṃsa', the meaning 'cursed among men' would be more feasible than the 'curser among men' with regard to 'nṛśaṃsa'. It is fairly logical, therefore, to give to it the usual sense of 'those who do harm to men', as has been done by most scholars. In this connection Hauer's querry as to how, in this sense, the Nṛśamsas can be looked upon as constituting a class different from those with which the other Vrātyas are associated,[4] is baseless. In this passage it is obvious that the emphasis lies on exposing the debase characteristics of the Vrātyas, and not on classifying them into definite groups. The explanation of Sāyaṇa, 'nṛśaṃsa-ninditāḥ manuṣyair abhiśaṃsena papādhyāropeṇa garhitāḥ santo' ('they are considered to be sinful, with sins being superimposed on them by people'), is perhaps based on a wrong reading of the text (nṛśaṃsa-ninditā, instead of nṛśaṃsa and nindita), and as such not much importance can be attached to it. Kātyāyana's statement, however, with regard to the initiation as Gṛhapati of one who is either 'nṛśaṃsa-tama', or the richest or the most learned among the Vrātyas,[1] is rather difficult to understaad. It is apparent that 'nṛśaṃsa-tama' in this context refers to the 'chief of the nṛśaṃsas' and cannot be interpreted as 'one who harms most' among them. It seems more likely, as it is certainly a careless copy of Lāṭyāyana's version which has the three pre-requisites of the Gṛhapati as 'adhyayana' (study), 'abhijana' (pedigree) and 'bhoga-lābha' (acquisition of wealth), that the increased contempt for the Vrātyas in later times, may have been responsible for the appearance of 'nṛśaṃsa-tama' in the context of the Vrātya-gṛhapati.

---

[1] V. 5.3.7.

---

[1] Kātyāyana, however, refers to them as 'ninditā nṛśamsāh'. It is not impossible that 'nṛśaṃsānāṃ' has been omitted by the editor of the Āpastamba text.

[2] Op. cit. 155.

[3] An exception is found only in R.V. II. 26.1., where undoubtedly 'śaṃsa' stands for the 'singer'—(cf. Sāyaṇa 'brāhmaṇaspateḥ stotā and Grassman: Lobsaenger).

[4] Op. cit. 149 n. 274.

Next come the youngest members (kaniṣṭha), who probably had newly accepted the Vrātya way of life. They may not necessarily be younger in age, but their belief in the efficacy of the Vrātya performances was newly established. Whether this class was represented by those who were formerly Brahmans but later gave up their orthodox beliefs and engaged themselves in Vrātya practices, or not, is a question difficult to answer. They are again, in the view of the Brāhmaṇakāra, the objects of bitter calumny (hīnā va ete hīyante) presumably because their entry into the Vrātya-fold was comparatively more recent than that of others, and as such the need for their conversion was keenly felt.

Lastly, the eldest members, who obviously were those who had conformed to the unorthodox practices since long, and were considered as 'elders' in their community, are enjoined to perform with the stoma of the Śama-nīca-meḍhras. The meaning of this word is not explained in the Tāṇḍya, and to understand its implications we have to rely on Lāṭyāyana's interpretation, as he alone among the Sūtrakāras analyses it. According to him it stands for those 'who, through old age, are incapable of procreation' (sthavirād apeta-prajananā ye te śama-nīca-meḍhrāḥ).[2] The particular 'stoma' which is referred to as that connected with this class is not described, but the scheme of the verses to be chanted during the performance is indicated—'agrād agraṃ rohanty ūrdhvāḥ stomāḥ yānty anapabhraṃśāya' (higher and higher they ascend; the 'stomas' go upwards, (increase in number of verses) in order that they may not fall down),[1] which Sāyaṇa thinks agrees with Māṣaka III. 11—('etac cordhva-stomatvam kalpakāreṇa darśitam). Caland too, accepts the identity of this rite with that in the Māṣaka. Hauer, however, imagines it to be a form of some old 'primitive Vrātya sacrifice' (lin altes, primitives Vratya-Opfer) different from the Vrātya-stomas. He argues that it is no 'ṣoḍaśin', since according to the scheme presented in the Ārṣeyakalpa (i.e . Māṣaka) the sixteenth-versed stotra is not mentioned in connection with this type of Vrātya-stoma, and, as such, it is in no way a 'conversion sacrifice'.[2] Further, the fact that it is recorded in the Tāṇḍya as one of the Vrātyastomas, despite its unusual form, could be accounted for by supposing that the Jyeṣṭhas were not allowed to keep this heretic sacrifice and with the help of a curious Sāman it was changed after the form of an Agniṣṭoma and thus was designated as a Vrātya-stoma'.[3] This is certainly mere conjecture unsupported by textual evidence. The reason for the absence of the Ṣoḍaśa-stoma in this sacrifice (Vrātya-stoma), therefore, has to be explained in some other manner. It seems that XVII.4.3., throws some light on this unusual form of the Śama-nīca-meḍhrastoma. In this it is mentioned 'the Śamanīcameḍhras sacrificed with this stoma; Kuṣītaka Sāmaśravas was their 'gṛhapati': Luṣākapi Khārgali (son of Khargala) cursed them saying: "they have fallen off, (avakīrṣata) they have used the two lesser Stomas", therefore no one among the Kauṣītakins distinguishes himself; fallen from sacrifice, (yajñāvakīrṇa) forsooth are they". From this Hauer concludes : (a) the founder of the famous school of the Kauṣītakins was a chief of the Vrātyas; (b) the eldest among the Vrātyas sacrificed under his leadership and this primitive form of sacrifice is specially connected with him; (c) the sacrifice mentioned here is not the same as that in

---

[1] 'yo nṛśaṃsa-tamaḥ syāt dravyavattamo vā' nucānatamo vā tasya gārhapatye dīkṣeran'. XXII. 4. 7.

[2] VIII. 6.4.

---

1. Tāṇḍya : XVII. 4.2.
2. The importance of the Soḍaśa-stoma for conversion is clearly stated by the Tāṇḍya—See above.
3. Op. cit. 119.

Māṣaka III. 11., as the curse of Luṣākapi who probably represents the orthodox outlook presumes a religious strife between the Vrātya and the orthodox cults. Prior to our consideration of the validity of these deductions, reference may be made to passages in the Jaiminīya (II. 126) and in the Nidāna-sūtra (VI. 11. 12.), which are of some interest in this connection. Of the Jaiminīya passage, only a sentence quoted by Caland in his index to the 'Das. J. B. in Auswahl' is known to us.[1] It appears in the context of the Vrātya-stomas, and reads: 'the Śoḍaśa Pavamāna is to be applied for the Aiṣīka-pāvas who had Kuṣītaka as their gṛhapati' (kuṣītaka-gṛhapatīnāṃ aiṣīka-pāvānaṃ ṣoḍaśapavamānāḥ). The excerpt from the Nidāna states that 'there are two classes of Vrātyas, the Śīrṣādis and the Aiṣīka-yāvis, of whom the former are known to be the older ones' (dvaye vai vrātyā bhavnti, śīrṣādayas caiṣīkayāvayaś ca; jyāyāṃsaḥ khalu śīrṣādayo bruyate). That the Aiṣīka-pāvas are identical with the Aiṣīka-yāvis, (as suggested by Caland and Hauer) seems plausible as none of these two designations are to be met with anywhere else either in the Brāhmaṇas or the Sūtras. The Śīrśādis may have been mentioned in the Jaiminīya, too, but no reference to them is found in its extant portions. There is no reason, however, to imagine with Hauer that 'Aiṣīka-yāvi', formed from 'iṣīka' (reed) and 'yu' (to hang) conveys a meaning similar to that of 'Śama-nīca-meḍhra', as it is purly a matter of coincidence and merely indicates that both represent the same class of Vrātyas. The reason why they are designated as 'Aiṣīka-yāvi' or (Aiṣīka-pāvas) in some texts and 'Śama-nīca-meḍhra' here is not known but it may be suggested that probably the compiler of the Tāṇḍya intended to express contempt for this class in a more direct manner, and hence used the latter expression. Thus the sacrifice performed under Kuṣītaka, the 'gṛhapati' of the Aiṣīka-pāvas (or the Śama-nīca-meḍhras), who, together with the Śīrṣādis form the oldest class of Vrātyas, may have been a type of Vrātya-stoma prescribed for the comparatively more ancient Vrātyas, in which some mistake was obviously committed. It is interesting to note that while the Jaiminīya prescribes the use of the 32 pavamānas for the Vrātyas in general, it enjoins the use of the 'ṣoḍaśa pavamānā' for the Aiṣīka-pāvas, which implies that the later were distinct from the former. It is possible that the conversion of such Vrātyas was not an easy one and hence special injunctions had to be laid down for them. In the Tāṇḍya, again the scheme of the verses to be chanted by them had to be changed, the reason for which may have been that they still represented the most disagreeable element among the Vrātyas. Thus, it cannot be maintained that the sacrifice mentioned here is a form of primitive Vrātya sacrifice, merely on the basis of the contempt expressed in designating them as 'Śama-nīca-meḍhras'. It is more reasonable to infer from this that the 'magic effect' of the comparatively late 'ṣoḍaśa-stoma' was not enough for the conversion of the Aiṣīka-pāvas, and hence the 'ūrdhva-stoma' had to be prescribed for them, which again has the 32nd. Stoma (according to Māṣaka III.11). The second passage in the Nidāna states that 'according to Dhānañjaya the Kauṣītakin were not well-cursed' (akuśalānuvyāhṛtān Kauṣītakīn manya iti Dhānñjayyaḥ), from which Caland infers that 'Dhānañjayya seems to defend the manner of the Kauṣītakin's. Keith, however, reads 'akuśalān' (unskilful), 'vyāhatān' (deprived) instead of 'akuśalānuvyāhṛtān', which confirms (in his opinion) the fact that disrespect was shown to this school. In the Tāṇḍya, these Kauṣītakins are apparently connected with Kuṣītaka Sāmaśravas. The epithet Sāma-śravas, added to the name of the 'gṛhapati' of the Vrātyas in this context, is rather interesting as it presupposes that the chief of the Vrātyas was a Brahman, since only the members of this class had such titles in those days. Again it is significant that the epithet is missing in the Jaiminīya version, which leads us to presume that it was possibly superimposed later on due to some special reason. Can it be that the Tāṇḍya-Brāhmaṇa-kāra was eager to connect the chief of the Vrātyas with the ancestor of the Kauṣītakins or the founder of their school in order to account for the well-known stigma on the Kauṣītakins, for which the reason was apparently unknown ? The addition of the epithet, therefore, was deliberate.

---

[1] The text of the Jaiminīya is not yet fully edited.

Thus Hauer's inference that Kuṣītaka was an ancestor of Śāṅkhāyana with whom a Brāhmaṇa text better known as the 'Kauṣītaki'[1] came to be associated, and that the Kauṣītakins were probably converted Vrātyas, does not seem logical. Similarly Luṣākapi Khārgali, who in the Jaiminīya (II. 122) is referred to as one of the Brahmans in the court of Keśin Dālbhya, a king of the Pāñcālas, together with Ahīna Āśvatthi, Keśī Sātyakāmī and Cāngīna Rāhakṣita is not necessarily a representative of the orthodox ritualists, as according to Baudhāyana the pāñcālas in general were well-known as 'invokers of curses' especially with reference to Kuru-Vrātyas. This bitter contempt may have been due to political reasons as the Kuru-Pāñcāla rivalry may have originated as early as the age of the Tāṇḍya, though it is not specifically mentioned therein. The mention of Keśin Dālbhya again, in the Śrauta Sūtra of Baudhāyana is of little significance as there is no evidence in the Brāhmaṇas of his being an 'opponent of the orthodox rites' (as Hauer thinks), and even if there is some textual evidence for his being a contemporary of Kauṣitaki, (which is far from possible as it is merely a traditional view of the ancient school of the Kauṣītakins that the Brāhmaṇakāra quotes) Luṣākapi, a Brahman of his court, obviously cannot be contemporaneous with Kuṣītaka, and as such the three references quoted above (Tan:XVII. 4. 3., Baudh. Sr. S: XVIII. 26., Kaus: VII. 4) cannot have any intermittent connection as implied by Hauer, in his conclusions mentioned above. Thus both Kuṣītaka and Luṣākapi have been purposely brought together here to account for a fact, which, as we have seen above, was almost inexplicable.

Regarding the Vrātīnas, among whom, according to Lāṭyāyana the 'well-versed sons of the warriors are to be chosen as priests for the Śyena' (vrātīnānāṃ yaudhānāṃ putrān anūcānām ṛtvijo vṛṇīta śyenasya), it is difficult to say whether they have any connection whatsoever with the Vrātyas. In the ṣaḍviṃśa it is only stated that 'one wishing to do harm to his rival or enemy',[2] should perform athe Śyena ceremony,

---

[1] The other name of the Brāhmaṇa is the Śānkhāyana Brāhmaṇa.

[1] cf. Sāyaṇa 'bhrātṛvya-hiṃsām bhāvayed ity arthaḥ.

(abhicaran yajeta),[1] and the 'priests' are mentioned as 'having or wearing red turbans, and red garments, and also putting on the sacrificial thread round their necks' (lohitoṣṇīsā lohitavāsaso nivīta ṛtvijaḥ).[2] That 'abhicaran' refers to one wishing to destroy his enemy is clear from the injunctions laid down in the same context referring to the purpose with which the sacrificer undertakes to perform. (yam kāmayeta jihetiti-'him whom one wishes to deprive of his cattle etc. Sāyaṇa: 'paśvadibhir hiyeteti'). Śāṇḍilya's reference to the Arhats from whom the priests are chosen for the Śyena ceremony does not necessarily imply that they represented the highest class of the Vrātīna, as Hauer thinks,[3] since it is unreasonable to think that 'arhat', which appears in the Brāhmaṇas,[4] only as an honorific, signifying 'the worthy one', is used by the Sūtra-kāra in this context, specially for designating a certain class of Vrātīnas. Lāṭyāyana's statement referring to the Ṛtviks in this sacrifice being chosen from the warrior-clan, is, however, of some importance, as it imports a non-Brahmanical character to this special performance of the Vrātīnas. It is an accepted fact that in all Brahmanical sacrifices, the 'ṛtviks' are always Brahmans.[5]

Summing up our conclusions derived from the references to the Vrātyas in the Brāhmaṇas, it may be stated primarily that the Jaiminīya version is decidedly older than that of the Tāṇḍya. The Vrātyas are non-Brahmans performing rituals, which seem to be similar to some of the orthodox Brahmanic rites, but differ in details. From the description of their outfit it seems they are Northerners, though it is impossible to locate their actual habitat from these references alone. They have much in common with the members of the warrior-class. They are considered to be sinful, inasmuch as they do not abide by the rules of Brahmanic performance. They could be incorporated within the Brahman folk only through

---

1. III. 8.2.
2. 'sind die Arhat als der hochste Stand der 'Vrātīna' anzusehen (203).
3. cf. Ait. Br.—I. 16; Sat. Br.—III.4.1.1.
4. cf. VI.I. 112.
5. The testimony of Patañjali has not been taken into consideration here, as it represents a later view-point.

the performance of the Vrātyastomas, which are all conversion ceremonies, and have the form of the Ekāhas. The names of their chiefs, divine (sthapati) or otherwise (gṛhapati), e.g., 'Budha Saumya', 'Dyutāna Māruta', 'Kuṣītaka Sāmaśravas' are partly real as the Brahman epithets attached to them are undoubtedly superimposed. There is no trace of either the 'characteristic traits of the Non-Aryan' or peculiarities associated with the primitive 'magician' or 'Yogin' in these Brāhmaṇa passages and the need for their conversion seems to have arisen from the conflict between the two forms of ritual : the Brahmanical and the Vrātya, which impeded the progress of the former and led to a strong opposition against the establishment of the orthodox tradition. The semi-mythical Pṛthu Vainya alone appears together with the Divine Vrātyas, an incident which indicate that the Vainyas were looked upon as Vrātyas by the orthodox ritualists.

Concluding this chapter, the description of the Vrātyastomas in the Śrauta Sūtras may be briefly reviewed. Lāṭyāyana, Kātyāyana and Āpastamba, as indicated above, render valuable assistance to the understanding of some of the difficult words appearing in the traditional account of the Vrātyas in the Tāṇḍya. Of these three versions, that of Āpastamba is of little interest as it is only a statement in outline of the four Vrātyastomas. 'Vrātyānāṃ pravāse' in the opening sentence (XXII. 5. 4.), however, has been wrongly interpreted both by Ghosh and Hauer. It refers simply to 'the Vrātyas who lived and performed their sacrifices outside the sphere of Brahman influence',[1] and implies as suggested above that in the days of Āpastamba who certainly belongs to an earlier period than that of the other two Sūtrakāras, the number of unconverted Vrātyas living outside the Brahmanical pale was considerable, though conversions were not infrequent. Lāṭyāyana, though far separated from the age of the Tāṇḍya, is certainly more lucid in his treatment of the Vrātya-stomas. He introduces for the first time, however, the 'Māgadhadeśīya Brahma-bandhu' as one of the recipients of the sacrificial gifts during the performance of the Vrātyastomas. He may have borrowed the phrase from Baudhāyana, who refers more explicitly to the non-Māgadha, nominal Brahman, bearing the title Māgadha, (amāgadho māgadha-vākyo brahmabandhuh)[1] among the Vrātyas. It is not very clear what he implies by this, and the only inference that can be drawn from these two references is that the basis of the association of the Māgadha with the Eka-vrātya in the Atharvaveda was presumably unknown to the Sūtra-karas, and thus while Baudhāyana thought that the Māgadha was impersonated as such by the Vrātyas who were nominal Brahmans, Lāṭyāyana imagined him to be the Brahma-bandhu coming from the land of the Māgadhas.[2] In other words, the absence of any connection of the non-Brahman Vrātyas with the later much-despised Māgadha led these Sūtra-kāras to propose various interpretations. It is also possible that Baudhāyana at least conceives of a ritualistic background for the description of the Vrātya-retinue in A. V. XV., as he mentions the 'impersonated hetaira' (pumśacalū-vākya) too, in this context. Lāṭyāyana's closing sentence 'vrātya-stomair iṣṭvā traividya-vṛttiṃ samtiṣṭheyuḥ' (after having performed with the Vrātya-stomas, they should live the life of those well-versed in triple knowledge) shows a later development, inasmuch as the converted Vrātyas had not only to give up their former sinful practices, but also to engage themselves in orthodox performances.

Kātyāyana repeats almost verbatim the remarks of Lāṭyāyana, except that he uses the term 'Vrātya-gaṇa' (band of Vrātyas) to designate the Vrātyas in general which may indicate that by his time, the rapid process of assimilation may have left only a few of the Vrātyas unconverted. Much significance, however, cannot be attched to this expression as 'gaṇa' here may have no special sense, and there is hardly any textual evidence to support the commentator's view. The expression 'vyavahāryyā bhavanti' (worthy of being used for ritual purposes) here, with reference to the converted Vrātyas also presupposes that the influence of the Brahmans was being gradually recognised by the Vrātyas, and their conversion was tantamount to complete subordination.

---

[1] XVIII. 25.

[2] The commentator suggests 'asamyag gāyanah' (unskilful vocalist).

Baudhāyana's statements are rather of a curious nature. In XVIII. 24., he speaks of a ceremony which is probably the same as the initiation rite (dīkṣā) described elsewhere in the Brāhmaṇas and the other Sūtras, in the context of the Vrātyas. It is most unlikely that this should be a special ceremony performed by the Vrātyas similar to the orthodox initiation rite, as Hauer thinks since it is clear from the text that the acts mentioned here are indirectly connected only with the Sthapati, who is either a 'Kṣatriya' or 'Brahman' as it is to them alone that the Vrātyas wish to present sacrificial gifts.[1] These preparatory acts are as if meant to be performed by the Sthapati, with a view to the observance of the vow of the initiated (dīkṣita-vrata). The ceremony is symbolic, as the Vrātyas, for whom the sacrifice is executed by the Sthapati 'having approached the sacrifice in a hidden manner do not actually perform it' (te ye evam etam yajña-kratuṃ parokṣaṃ upetya pratyakṣam nopeyuh). Such statements are common to the Brāhmaṇas and indicate only an apparent form of sacrifice without its actual performance. Thus there can be no hidden reference here to some primitive form of Vrātya ritual. Again XVIII. 25., must be considered along with this as the preparatory ceremony immediately precedes the performance of the Vrātya-stomas with which Baudhāyana is primarily concerned. What Baudhāyana has in his mind is perhaps the intiation of the Sthapati, in the usual manner of the Brahmans, as he has to perform for those who are 'fallen from the initiated ones' (dikṣitāvakīrṇin). It is clear, therefore, that Baudhāyana, probably the oldest among the Sūtra-kāras, was much more conversant with th actual performance of the Vrātya-stomas than the others. Eventually he records a tradition which is obviously lost to the latter Sūtra-kāras. Precisely the Brāhmaṇa-like form of these passages leads up to the conclusion that they may have formed an appendix to some descriptive chapter on the Vrātya-stomas of some text other than the Tāṇḍya (which follows a different tradition). Still further, XVIII. 26., as shown above, has some political significance and the mention of Gaupālāyana Vaiyāghra-padya, in all possibility a Brahman, as the Sthapati of the Vrātyas among the Kurus is indicative of the fact that in the opinion of Baudhāyana the Sthapati of the Vrātyas was in most cases a Brahman.

---

[1] te rājani vā brāhmaṇe vā pratigrahaṃ icchantic,......te yam abhisañjānante tam sthapatiṃ kurvanti sa eṣāṃ vratāni carati).

Finally Śāñkhāyana's account of the Vrātya-stomas hints at a still later stage, when they ceased to be conversion ceremonies and became expiatory rites (prāyaścitta)· It has been pointed out above, fairly clearly, that there is no evidence to prove that the ancestor of Śāṅkhāyana was a Vrātya and even if we accept a comparatively earlier date for the Śāñkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, it does not necessarily follow that the above description too, is to be connected with an earlier period.

Appendix to Chapter II

The evidence for clan-exogamy, which is identical with the later 'gotra-exogamy' has already been investigated. It may now prove profitable to refer to the well-known passage in the Śatapatha,[1] from which the inference of the Sapiṇḍa restrictions may be drawn.

The context in question is that of the separation of the sacrificial spoons (the 'juhū and the 'upabhṛt') by the Adhvaryu during the performance of the Sūktavāka; the reading in the Mādhyandina recension is slightly different from that in the Kāṇva recension. In the former we have: 'tadvā etat samāna eva karman vyākriyate tasmādu samānādeva puruṣād attā cādyaśca jāyete, idāṃ hi caturthe puruṣe tṛtīye saṇ-gacchāmaha iti vedevaṃ vidīvyamānā jātyā āsate; etasmādu tat' which has been translated by Eggeling as follows: 'thus the separation (of the eater and the eaten) is effected in one and the same act, and hence from one and the same man spring both the enjoyer (the husband) and the one to be enjoyed (the wife); for now kinsfolk live sporting and rejoicing together saying: In the fourth (or) third man (i. e. generation) we unite. And this is so in accordance with that (separation of the spoons).[2] In the latter after 'jāyete' we have 'uta hi tṛtīye puruṣe saṇgacchāmahe, caturthe saṇgacchāmaha iti videvaṃ vidīvyamāna āsate jātiyā asya sma iti', which may be rendered thus: "Thinking we unite either in the third man or in the fourth (man)", they indulge in amorous sports[3] (saying) 'we are (both) related to this one', (the founder of the family).

It is generally accepted that this passage has a direct bearing upon the Sapiṇḍa restrictions, but it may be noted that scholars[1] in agreement with the commentators have apparently taken this ending (etasmādu tat) as expressing a certain approval of these degrees of intermarriage, a different construction is permissible in as much as it is an ending typical of the style of the Brāhmaṇas, and of itself expressive of neither approval nor disapproval: on the other hand, an inference can be drawn that separation (of the spoons) and union (of the relatives) are difficult to correlate. Why should a metaphor of separation be introduced into a text dealing with marriage, unless to express disagreement with such marriage? Therefore, is one not-at liberty to disagree with the authors of the Vedic Index who state that 'the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa expressly recognises marriage within the third degree on either side'[2] as drawing an unjustified inference, despite the fact that later Smṛtikāras[3] construe this passage as a definite injunction in favour of such marriage? Lastly, it is significant that the scholiast on Vajrasūci contends that the Vājasaneyins forbade marriage with the daughter of the mother's brother.[4]

---

[1] I.8.3.6.

[1] S.B.E. XII. 238.

[2] It may be suggested that 'videvam dīvyamānā' and 'videvaṃ vidīvyamānā', the meaning of which is not very clear, can be taken as an euphemism for 'contracting marriage', in consideration of the context.

---

1. Eggeling, in agreement with Weber and others, construes this passage as meaning that the prohibition of inter-marriage between near-blood relations was not yet fully established. Among the commentators we hear of the practice of marriage in the third generation with reference to the 'Kāṇvas', the fourth to the Saurāṣṭras and the third alone to the Dākṣiṇātyas. Karandikar and Kapadia hold such marriage as permissible only to cognates in this context. (H. E. 69; H. K. 63).
2. V. I. I. 236.
3. cf. S. C. 1. 72.
4. V. I. Ibid.

GENERAL BIBILIOGRAPHY

BERGAIGNE, ABEL. — *La religion Vedique d'apres les Hymnes du Rigveda.* (*Rel.Ved.*)

BHANDARKAR, D. R. — *Some aspects of Ancient Indian culture.*

BOHTLINGK & ROTH. — *Sanskrit Woerterbuch.* (*P.W.*)

BLOOMFIELD, M. — 1. *Vedic Concordance H.O.S. Vol. X.*
2. *Hymns of the Atharveveda* (*H. A. V.*)

CALAND, W. — *The Brāhmaṇa of Twenty-five chapters* (*P.B. trans.*)

CHANDA, R. P. — *Survival of the pre-historic civilisation of the Indus valley-Memoirs of the Archeological survey of India.* 41-1929. (*M.A. S.I.*).

DELBRUECK, B. — *Die Indogermanischen Verwandtschaftsnammen— Abhandlungen ; Sach. Akademie der Wissenschaften. Bd.* 25. (*D.I.V.*)

EGGELING, J. — *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (*S.B.E.*)

GELDNER, C. F. —*Der Ṛgveda* (*D.R.*) *and* (*D. R. in the Harvard Oriental Series*).

GRASSMAN, H. —*Woerterbuch zum Ṛgveda.* (*W. Z. R.*)

GHOSH, N. N. —*Indo-Aryan Literature and Culture Origins.* 1934.

HAUER, J. W. —1. *Der Vrātya.* (*D. V.*)
2. *Die Anfaenge des Yogapraxis*

HILLEBRANDT, A. —1. *Ritual-Literatur—Grundrise der Indoarischen Philologie. Indoarischen Philologie. Bd.* 3. *Heft.* 2. (*R. L.*)
2. *Lieder des Ṛgveda.* (*L. R.*)

KANE	—*History of Dharma Śāstra.*
KAPADIA, K. M.	—*Hindu Kinship.*
KARANDIKAR.	—*Hindu Exogamy.*
KARMARKAR.	*The Vrātya systems of Religion. (Religions of India. Vol. I.)*
KEITH, A. B.	—*Ṛgveda Brāhmaṇas—Translated H.O.S.* 25. *(R. B.—trans.—)*
KEITH & MACDONNEL	—*Vedic Index (V.I.).* 2 *vols.*
MAJUMDAR & PUSALKER	—*The Vedic Age (V.A.)*
OLDENBERG, H.	—1. *Ṛgveda—text kritische und exegetische Noten (Ṛgvedanoten).* 2. *Die Religion des Veda.* 3. *Vedic Hymns. II. (V.H.II.)*
SARDA, H. V.	—*Dayanand Commemoration Volume.*
SCHRAEDER	—*Pre-historic Antiquities.*
THIEME, P.	—*Fremdling in Ṛgveda.*
WEBER, A.	1. *Akademisch evorlesungen Literature geschischte des alt Indens. (Lit. ges.)* 2. *History of Indian Literature (translation by Mann & Zacharie).*
WINZERNITZ, M.	—1. *Geschichte der Indischen Lite ratur 3 Vols. (Ges. Lit.)* 2. *The History of indian Liteature translated by Mrs. Kretkar. (H.I.L.).*
ZIMMER, H.	*Altindisches Leben (Alt. Leben)*

PERIODICALS.

Acta Orientalia. (A.O.).

American Journal of Philology. (A.J.P.).

Bulletin de la Sociéte Linguistique. (B.S.L.).

Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute. (B.D.R.I.).

Calcutta Review. (C.R.).

Indische Studien. (I. St.).

Journal of the American Oriental Society. (J.A.O.S.).

Journal of the Bombay Branch, Royal Asiatic Society (J.B.Br.R.A.S.).

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Gt. Britain & Ireland. (J.R.A.S.).

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. [J.R. A.S. (Ben.)]

Memoires do la sociète Linguistique. (M.S.L.).

Nachrichten von der Gessellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Goettingen (N.G.).

Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Science.

Zeitschrift fuer Buddhismus.

Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morganlandischen Gesellschaft. (Z.D.M.G.)

INDEX

A

Abel Bergaigne 107
Abhijit 141
Abhiplava 141
Abhiṣechanīya 129
Ādhānamantra 80
Adhvaryu 155, 156, 158, 173
Adityas 142
Agni 9, 29, 53
——*Gārhapatya* 30
Agnihotra 29, 63, 71, 76
Agniṣṭoma 28, 69, 164
Agnyādhāna 79
Āgrāyaṇa 45
Agredidhiṣu 32
———*pātih* 43
Ahīna Āśvatthi 167
Aindra Bārhaspatya-caru 44
Aiśas 151
Aiṣīka-pāvas 165, 166
———*Yavis* 165
Aitareya 29, 75, 141, 151, 158
Āmanamantra 63
Aṅgas 131
Aṅgirasas 50, 98, 118
———, Bhṛgv 133
Ānujāvara 32, 44-51, 77
Anukramaṇī 86, 98, 125
Anupadam 19
Anupadeśa 100
Anuṣṭubh 139, 140
Ānuṣūka 44, 46
Āpastamba 18, 43, 127, 133, 137, 157, 158, 161, 169
———Dharma Sūtra 127
Āpastambīya 127, 128
A. P. Karmarkar 88, 102
Apsarasas 91, 108, 134-136
Āptyas 38
Āraṇyaka, Taittirīya 159
Arbuda 139
Ārṣeyakalpa 164
Ārya 74
Aryaman 2, 4
Āśā 27
Āṣāḍha Sāvayasa 67
Asia Minor 91
Asita Dhāmnya 28
Asuras 28, 29, 74, 148
Āśvalāyana 36
———*Gṛhya Sūtra* 34
Aśvamedha 80, 158
Aśvaṣ ūkti 148, 149,151
Aśvattha 15
Āśvatthi, Ahīna 167
Āśvina Śastra 151
Aśvins 9, 45
Atharvan 54, 65, 94, 101, 127, 131, 136
———*Brāhmaṇa* 127
———*Ekavrātya* 129
———*Saṁhitā* 83
———Upaniṣads 83, 125, 136
———Vrātya 83, 84, 91, 127
Atharvaveda 10, 22, 35, 37, 42, 67, 78, 82, 86, 89, 96, 102, 110, 112, 124-126, 128, 130, 134, 170
Atirātra 141, 151
Ātmanepada 25
Aufrecht 88
———, Theodor 82
Auśija 119
Avestan 35
Āyu 141

B

Banjaras 117
Baudhāyana 18, 99, 137, 147, 150, 154, 155, 157, 158, 167, 169-172
Bechtel 107, 109-111, 113, 116, 117, 119-121
Bergaigne 1, 112, 116-118, 120, 121, 135, 162
———, Abel 107
Bhaga 162
Bhagavata 90
———Rajaram Ramkrishna 84
———, R. R. 88
Bhandarkar 103, 104
———, D. R. 88, 102
Bhargava Ṛṣi 122
Bhats 117
Bhaṭṭabhāskara 25-27, 49
———Miśra 15, 24, 40, 48
Bhava 90, 126
———Swāmin 18
Bhils 89
Bhrātṛvya 32, 52, 54-60, 77
Bhṛgus, Kevala 140
Bhṛgv-aṅgirasas 133
Bhūmi-Sūkta 101
Bihar 84

Black Yajurveda 10, 22, 37, 44, 53, 78, 98, 99
B. L. Mukerjee 88, 95
Bloomfield 1, 37, 55, 70, 86-88, 91, 93, 100, 132
Böhtlingk 33, 36, 37, 51, 55, 83, 87, 88, 106
Brahmabandhus 83, 157, 169
Brāhmaṇa, Atharvan 127
———, *Gopatha* 86
———, *Jaiminīya* 124
———, *Jaiminīya Upaniṣad* 136, 140, 151
———, *Kauṣītaki* 99
———, *Pañcaviṁśa* 11
———, *Ṣaḍviṁśa* 83
———, *Śatapatha* 174
———, *Taittirīya* 38, 39, 76, 91
———, *Tāṇḍya* 124
Bṛhadāraṇyaka 133
Bṛhaspati 44, 46
Budha 99, 137, 141, 143
———, *Saumya* 169
———, *Sthapati* 141
Buddhism 97
Buehler 127, 128

C

Caland 11, 13, 14, 49, 50, 58, 66-69, 137-139, 141, 143, 155, 165, 166.
Carans 117
Caru, Aindra-Bārhaspatya 44
Cāturvarṇya 103
Chanda 104
———, R. P. 87, 88
Chāndogya Upaniṣad 86
Charpentier 89, 90, 92, 94, 96, 103, 124
———, J. 88
Chattopādhyāya 103
———, K. 88, 91

D

Dacca University Library 146
Daiva 141
———*Vrātyas* 141
Daivya 74
Dālbhya 167
Danastutīs 7
Darśapūrṇamāsa 77
Das J. B. in Auswahl 165
Das Vrātya Raetsel 81
Delbrueck 20, 22, 30-32, 37, 43, 54-57
Demimonde 112
Devadatta 56
Devarājayajvan 108
Dhāmmya, Asita 28
Dhananjaya 12, 18, 157, 158, 160, 166
Dharma 41
Dharma Sūtra, Āpastamba 127
Dhūr 67
Didhiṣūpati 32, 42, 43
———, Agre 43
Dionysus 91
Dravidian 103
D. R. Bhandarkar 88
———, Dr. 102
Dumezil 1-3, 5, 6
Durga 21, 95, 108, 112, 122
Dūtas 12
Dvādaśāha 12, 141
Dyūtāna Māruta 90, 98, 169

E

Edidhīṣupatiḥ 40
Eggeling 71, 113, 173
Ekādaśarātra 76
Ekāhas 12, 85, 169
Ekarāṭ 129
Ekarṣi 99, 129
Ekavrātya 98, 99, 101-103, 125, 130, 133, 138, 170
———, *Atharvan* 129

F

Father Heras 103
Fremdling 2

G

Gaṇa, Vrātya 170
Gandharis 131
Gandharvas 11, 28, 91, 134-136
Gandharva, Soma 121
Gāngīna Rahakṣita 167
Garagīrṇin 148, 151
Gārhapatya, Agni 30
Gauḥ 141
Gaupālāyana Vaiyāghra-padya 172
Gaurīvita 28
Gautama 144, 145
Gazelle 120
Geldner 1, 6, 9, 62, 113, 117
Ghosh 104, 132, 144-146, 148, 149, 151, 169
———, N. N. 88, 100
Gopatha Brāhmaṇa 86
Gopis 102
Grāmaṇī 67, 68, 71, 72, 76, 77
Grassman 1, 9, 22, 33, 36, 95, 105, 106
Gṛhapati 95, 156, 159, 160, 162, 163, 165
———, Vrātya 163
Gṛhyasūtra, Aśvalāyana 34
Griffith 33, 95

H

Hanns Oertel 113
Haradatta 127, 128

Harappa 103
Harivaṁśa 101
Hauer 81, 82, 86, 88, 94-96, 97, 99, 104, 124, 125, 128, 129, 132-135, 137-139, 143, 146, 148, 150-155, 157-162, 164, 165, 167-169, 171
———, J. W. 92
Heras, Father 103
Hetaira 108, 130, 153
Hetairai 108, 112, 117 , 121
Hillebrandt 36, 85, 86, 117
History of Indian Literature 83
Hopkins 87, 88

I

Index Vedic 10, 32, 33, 54, 56, 69, 90, 115, 131, 174
India 89, 91, 103, 108
Indian Literature, History of 83
Indische Studien 82
Indra 5, 46, 48, 71, 108, 109, 112-114, 119-121, 129
———mysticism 129
Indus Valley 87
Irā 131
Īśa 151
———*Śyāvāśvī* 151
Īśāna 93, 125, 126, 133, 137, 138, 141, 142
Iṣṭis 44, 54
———, *Kāmya* 65

J

Jaimini 79
Jaiminīya 12-14, 18, 19, 23, 28, 29, 57, 58, 66-68, 70, 72, 76, 95, 98, 99, 113, 132, 136-142, 149, 153, 165-168
———*Brāhmaṇa* 124
———*Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa* 136, 140, 151.
Jāmi 20-31
———*Śaṁsa* 69, 70
Jana 8-19
Janya 10
Jātavedas 69, 115
J. B. in Auswahl, Das 165
J. Charpentier 88
J. W. Hauer 92
Jyeṣṭhas 164

K

Kakṣīvat 117-119
Kalidasa 56
Kāmya Iṣṭis 65
Kāṇva 173
Kapiṣṭhala 39
Kapotapāka 82
Karaṇī 80
Karmarkar 103, 104
———, A. P. 88, 102
Kāṭhaka 10, 11, 22, 38, 39, 44, 53, 63, 64, 76
Kātyāyana 18, 19, 154, 157-160, 162, 169, 170
Kausalya, Prasenajit 68
Kauśika-Sūtrakāra 35
Kauṣītaki 167
———*Brāhmaṇa* 99
Kauṣītakin 164, 166, 167
Kāvya, Uśanas 148
K. Chattopādhyāya 88, 91
Keith, 11, 20, 36, 37, 51, 54, 55, 64, 65, 72, 73, 88, 89, 103, 120, 144, 166
Keśa-vapanīya 161
Keśin 167
Keśī Sātyakāmī 167
Kevala (gaṇas) 140
———*Bhṛgus* 140
Khadira 129
Khāragali 164
———, *Luṣākapi* 167
Kuṣītaka 149
Kimidins 135
Kīkaṭa-pradeśa 103
Klemm, Kurt 16
Kosāmbi 118
Koṣa, Vedic 48
Kṛṣṇa 102
———*lalāma* 45
Kulāyinī Viṣṭuti 49
Kunakhī 39
Kurt Klemm 16
Kurus 137, 172
Kuru-pāñcāla 167
———*Vrātyas* 167
Kuśinara 89
Kuṣītaka 99, 165, 167
———*Sāmaśravas* 164, 166, 169

L

Langlois 95
Lanman 36, 82, 86, 88, 91, 93
Lāṭyāyana 18, 83, 93, 144, 145, 156-160, 163, 167-170
———*Śrauta Sūtra* 12, 18, 85
Library, Dacca University 146
Licchavis 89
Lubdhaka 95
Ludwig 37, 95
Luṣākapi 164, 165, 167
———*Khārgali* 167

M.

Macdonell 20, 36, 37, 53, 55, 73, 88, 103, 120

Mādhava 114
———, Veñkaṭa 114
Mādhyandina 173
Magadha 83, 86, 89, 94, 103, 131, 132.
———*deśīya* 131, 132, 157, 169
Māgadha 102, 103, 130-132 153, 170
Magas 103
Maghavan 113
Mahābrāhmaṇa, *Tāṇḍya* 82, 84, 87
Mahadeva 93, 98, 125, 126, 133
Mahārāṣṭra 85
Mahāvrata 74, 76, 97, 100, 126, 129, 130, 132, 141, 153
Mahendra 76
Mahīdhara 22, 38, 40, 41, 62, 63, 65, 82, 131, 134
Māhiṣya 80
Maitrāyaṇī 22, 38, 39, 44, 46, 63, 64, 76, 130
———*Saṁhitā* 10
Mālavikāgnimitraṃ 56
Mallas 89
Mantra, *Ādhāna* 80
——— *Āmana* 63
Manu, 36, 85, 89
Marathā 85
Marathi 85
Mārjālīya 129
Māruta, *Dyūtāna* 90, 98, 169
Maruts 109, 114, 135
Māṣaka 164-166
Megasthenes 91
Menā 112, 113
Miśra, Bhaṭṭabhāskara 15, 24, 40, 48
Mitra 10, 131
Mohenjodaro 103, 104
Mūjavants 131
Mukerjee 104, 111, 114, 118, 119, 133, 142, 144, 146, 147
———, B. L. 88, 95
Mysticism, Indra 129

N.

Naighaṇṭuka 107, 115
Neisser 1
Nidāna 165, 166
———*Sūtra* 165
Nighaṇṭu 122
Nirukta 107
———*kāra* 122
Niṣādas 13
Niṣka 158
N. N. Ghosh 88, 100
Nṛśaṃsas 162
Nyagrodha 15

O

Oertel 113
———, Hanns 113
Ojha, R. G. 102
Oldenberg 1, 4, 5, 35, 36, 95, 107, 112, 115, 116, 118-120

P

Padapāṭha 48
Paippalāda 22, 35
Pajras 108, 109, 116-118
Pajrīya 117
Pāñcāla , *Kuru* 167
Pāñcālas 167
Pañcaviṁśa 12, 14, 16, 88, 90, 95, 132
———*Brāhmaṇa* 11
Pañca-Vrāta 106
Pāṇini 55
Parikrī 58
Parivitta 32, 40, 43
Parivividāna 32, 40, 43
Paryāyas 133
Paśupati 90, 126
Patanjali 59, 60, 82, 83
Pāvā 89
Pavamāna, Ṣoḍaṣa 165
Persia 103
Piśācas 135
Pischel 108-110, 112, 116-118, 120, 121
Pradeśa, *Kīkaṭa* 103
Praiṣika (hymns) 122
Prajāpati 46-48, 99, 125, 126, 130, 137, 138
Prakṛti 12
Prasenajit 69
———Kausalya 68
Praśna (Upaniṣad) 125
Praśnopaniṣad 99
Pratīka 53
Pratīvkavat 53
Pratīkṣā 27
Pravat 53
Prāyaṇīya 141
Pṛṣṭhas 66, 141
Pṛthi 140
———*Vainya* 140
Pṛthin 140
Pṛthu 140, 141
———*Vainya* 101, 140, 169
Pulindas 89
Puṁścalī 130-132
Puṁścalu 150
Punahstoma 148
Purāṇa, *Vāyu* 101
———, *Viṣṇu* 103
Puruṣamedha 26, 36, 39, 78, 91, 130, 134-136
Pūrvamīmāmsā Sūtras 79
Pūṣan 37

R.

Rahakṣita, Gāngīna 167
Rajaram Ramkrishna Bhagavat 84
Rājasūya 8, 13, 15, 18, 25, 71, 101, 126, 129, 130, 133, 156, 161,
Rākā 30
Rākṣasas 135
Rathakāra 78-80
Ṛbhu 79
R. G. Ojha 102
Ṛgveda 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 17, 20-22, 33, 37, 42, 44, 53, 61, 62, 64, 78, 89, 95, 96, 99 103, 105-108, 110, 112, 114 115, 117, 118, 130, 135, 149,162
———*Saṁhitā* 105
Roth 1, 33, 37, 51, 55,83, 87, 88, 106, 107, 110, 120, 124
R. P. Chanda 87, 88
R. R. Bhagavat 88
Ṛṣi, Bhārgava 122
Ṛta 25
Ṛtviks 168
Rudra 78, 86, 89, 90, 93, 94, 101,125, 126, 133, 135, 141, 142, 158, 159
———*Śiva* 126
———, *Vrātya* 90

S.

Śabaras 89
Sacrifice, Soma 141
———, *Śyena* 83
Sādhu 87
Ṣaḍviṁśa 12, 16, 88, 113 49, 152
———*Brāhmaṇa* 83
Sajāta 32, 61-72
——— *śaṃsa* 69
Śakadvīpa 103
Śākapūṇī 122
Sāman 115, 153, 155, 164
Śamanīcameḍhras 163-166
———*stoma* 164
Sāmaśravas 166
———, *kuṣītaka* 164, 166, 169
Samaveda 83, 85, 98, 99, 136
Samhīta, Atharvan 83
———, *Maitrāyaṇi* 10
———, *Ṛgveda* 105
———, *Taittirīya* 24, 46, 51
———, *Vājasaneyī* 22, 37, 78, 90, 124, 134
Samiti 68
Śaṃsa, Jāmi 69, 70
———, *Sajāta* 67
Śamyuvuka 81
Śaṇḍilya 12, 18, 157, 160, 168
Śāṇḍilyāyana 19
Śānkhāyana 158, 167, 172
———*Śrauta Sūtra* 172
Sānkhya-yoga 97
Sānnāyya 48
Sapiṇḍa 173
Sārkarākṣas 67
Śarva 90, 126
Śastra, Āśvina 151
Śāstri, Viśvabandhu 48
Śatapatha 12, 17, 66, 70, 71, 74, 77, 80, 113, 133, 140, 148, 150, 155, 158, 159, 161,
———*Brāhmaṇa* 174
Śatarudrīya 90, 126
Sātyakāmi , *Keśi* 167
Saudhanvan 80
Saumya, Buddha 169
Sāvitrī 134
———*patita* 85
Sāyaṇa 5, 9, 11-14, 16, 17, 21, 23-26, 33-38, 40, 41, 46, 48, 50-52, 54, 61, 62, 64, 65, 70, 71, 79, 95, 105, 106, 108, 110-115, 117, 119-122, 124, 143, 155, 156, 162, 164, 168
Schroeder 32
Siddhapuruṣa 87
Sīrsādis 165
Śiva 89, 90, 94, 102, 126
———, *Rudra* 126
Skandaswāmin 114
Śobhana 153
Śodaṣa Pacamāna 165
———*Stoma* 164
Soma 105, 142, 143, 147
———*Gandharva* 121
———*Sacrifice* 141
Sphya 71
Śrauta Sūtra, Baudhāyana 16
———, *Lāṭyāyana* 12, 18, 85
———, *Śānkhāyana* 172
Sthapati 71, 137, 143, 157, 171, 172
———Budha 141
Studien, Indische 82
———, Vedische 10, 108, 110
Śukra 77
Sūkta, Bhūmi 101
———*vāk* 71, 173
———, *Vrātya* 102
Surā 147
Sūta 71
Sūtra, Nidāna 165
Sūtrakāra, Kauśika 35
Sūtras, Pūrvamimāmsā 79
———,*Vaitāna* 35
Svarga 46
Svetāśvatāra 125
Śyāvāśva 68
Śyāvāśvī, Īśa 151

Śyena 167, 168
———Sacrifice 83

T.

Taittirīya 10-12, 18, 22, 23, 26, 28 ,44, 48, 54, 64-66, 69, 72, 74-76, 78, 79, 140, 149, 152
———*Āraṇyaka* 159
———*Brāhmaṇa* 38, 39, 76, 91
———*Saṃhitā* 24, 46, 51
Takṣan 78, 79
Tālavakāras 99
Tāṇḍins 113
Tāṇḍya 48, 49, 66, 74-76, 85, 89, 136-138, 141, 142, 145, 149, 151, 153, 155, 161, 163, 165-169, 171
———*Brāhmaṇa* 124
———*Mahābrāhmaṇa* 82, 84, 87
Theodor Aufrecht 82
Thieme 1, 3-7
Trita 38
Trivṛtstoma 49

U.

Udgātā 16, 156
Udgātṛs 66
Udumbara 15
Udvaṃśiya 66 , 67
Ugra 126
———*deva* 90
Upanaya 82
Upaniṣads, Atharvan 83, 125, 136
Upaniṣad, Chhāndogya 86
Uṣah 131
Uśanas 148, 151
———*Kāvya* 148
Uṣas 108, 112, 116, 122
Uśija 118, 119

V.

Vainya 140, 169
———,*Pṛthu* 101, 140, 169
Vaiśālī 89
Vaitāna Sūtras 35
Vailūnis 69
Vaiyāghra-padya, Gaupālāyana 172
Vājapeya 129
Vājasaneyī 38, 39, 53, 62, 130, 136
———*Saṃhitā* 22, 37, 78, 90, 124, 134
Vājasaneyins 174
Vajrasūci 174
Vāk 11
Vaṃśa 151
Varangians 100
Varṇa 74
Varuṇa 10, 25, 45, 142
Vaṣat (call) 151
Vasukra 5
Vāyu 138, 142
———*Purāṇa* 101
Vedic Index 10, 32, 33, 54, 56, 69, 90, 115, 131, 174
Vedic koṣa 48
Vedische Studien 10, 108, 110
Veṅkaṭa Mādhava 114
Vena 107, 121, 122
Vibhādhavat 53
Vijiti 54
Vikṛti 12
Vindhyas 89
Viṣṇu Purāṇa 103
Viṣṭuti, Kūlāyinī 49
Viśvabandhu Sāstri 48
Viśvajit 12, 14, 18, 141
Viśvarūpa 118
Vrāta 82, 97, 105, 106
———, *Pañca* 106
Vrātīnas 83, 88, 93, 97, 167, 168
Vrātya 81-103, 105-109, 111, 113, 115, 117, 121-172
———,Atharvan 83, 84, 91, 127
———,*Eka* 101-103, 125, 130, 133, 138, 170
———*gaṇa* 170
———*Gṛhapati* 163
———*Rudra* 90
———*Sūkta* 102
Vrātyas, Daiva 141
———, *Kuru* 167
Vratyastomas 82, 85, 86, 88-92, 95, 99, 100, 102, 103, 124, 133, 136, 138, 140, 141, 161, 164, 165, 169-172
Vṛddhi 48
Vrīhimata 82
Vṛṣaṇāśva 112, 113

W.

Weber 54, 56, 67, 73, 81-83, 85, 86, 88, 103, 144
White Yajurveda 22, 53
Whitney 34, 35, 37, 54, 55, 86
Wilson 95
Winternitz 73, 82, 88, 92, 95, 96, 104

Y.

Yajamāna 17
Yājñavalkya 85, 89
Yajurveda 65, 126, 131
———,Black 10, 22, 37, 44, 53,78, 99
———,White 22, 53

Yajuṣ 155
Yama 135
Yamī 135
Yāska 20, 21, 23, 95, 112, 121, 122
Yatis 87
Yoga 94
——, *Sāṅkhya* 97
Yogins 94-96, 135, 169

Z.

Z. D. M. G. 36
Zimmer 37, 38, 73, 84, 88, 117.

THE ŚATAPATHA-BRĀHMAṆA

(according to the text of the Mādhyandina school)

Translated by

Julius Eggeling and edited by Prof. F. Max Müller.

The ritual explanation of the White Yajur-Veda is to be found in extra-ordinary fulness in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa—the 'Brāhmaṇa of the hundred paths.' This work is next to Ṛg-veda the most important production in the whole range of Vedic literature and contains an earliest account of the deluge in India. Its treatment of the sacrificial ceremonial is throughout more lucid and systematic while its Upanishad is the finest product of Vedic philosophy. These treatises reflect the spirit of an age in which all intellectual activity is concentrated on the sacrifice, describing its ceremonies, discussing its value and speculating on its origin & significance. Sacred Books of the East Series vols. XII, XXVI, XLI, XLIII, and XLIV. Full Rexin Bound with gold letters in Demy Octavo. Price for 5 Volumes. Rs. 100-00

ATHARVA-VEDA SAṂHITĀ

Translated into English with a critical and exegetical commentary by W. D. Whitney. Complete in 2 volumes containing critical notes on the texts of different recensions, simple literal English translation and an elaborate critical and historical introduction. Cheap Indian Edition. Royal Octavo pp 160+1045. Full cloth-bound and printed on Antique paper. Price for 2 Volumes. Rs. 30-00

वैदिक धर्म एवं दर्शन [प्रथम भाग]

मूल लेखक–डा० ए० बी० कीथ, अनुवादक डा० सूर्यकान्त

मौलिकता के नाते आज तक वेदों ने ही भारतीय एकता को अक्षुण्ण रखा है और यह वेद भू के अनिश्चित गर्भ से मौलिक परम्परा द्वारा प्राप्त बाद में लिपिबद्ध कर दिये गये हैं। वैदिक धर्म क्या था और कैसा था, ऋषियों की दर्शन की क्षेत्र में कहाँ तक प्रगति थी, विद्वान लेखक ने उक्त पुस्तक में इसका अनूठा प्रर्दशन किया है।

सजिल्द २५-००

MOTILAL BANARSIDASS
DELHI :: VARANASI :: PATNA